Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, December 4, 2018
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements: The Academic Senate has received the General Education Task Force Report and Recommendations: Creating a Student-Focused and Distinctive Program at Cal Poly, October 2018, and it has been communicated to the General Education Governance Board for Review. The report is available at https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/Task_Force/GETF_Recommendations_Report20181020.pdf

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office: (p. 2).
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 3).
E. Statewide Senate: (pp. 4-49).
F. CFA:
G. ASI: (pp. 50-51).

IV. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:20 p.m.] University Campaign by Matthew Ewing, Vice President of Development.
B. WASC Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation by Bruno Giberti, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning.

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Senior Projects: Dawn Janke, Senior Project Task Force Chair, first reading (pp. 52-59).
B. Resolution on Proposed Organization of a new University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 60-66).
C. Resolution on Campus Climate: University Ombuds and Training: Paul Choboter, Math Department, first reading (pp. 67-101).
D. Resolution to Modify the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 102-103).
E. Resolution to Modify Section V. Meetings of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (p. 104).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Academic Senate  
December 4, 2018 – 3:10 pm  
President’s Report

1. **CSU Trustees approve naming of Justin and J. Lohr Center for Wine and Viticulture.**  
The Board of Trustees of the California State University passed a Resolution at the November 14-15, 2018 Board of Trustees meeting approving the naming of the newly constructed agricultural facilities at Cal Poly. The facilities will be named the Justin and J. Lohr Center for Wine and Viticulture.

2. **President’s Local Economic Development Committee.**  
President Armstrong convened his Council of Advisors ad hoc Local Economic Development Committee on Tuesday, November 27th. This is a group of over 75 people that represent our Central Coast region – from the north end of SLO County down through Northern Santa Barbara County - including local municipal government and private industry leaders, K-12 superintendents and higher education presidents and representatives from Cal Poly including Academic Senate Chair Dustin Stegner.

In addition to the President’s update, the group heard from SLO Partners on their successful efforts and future goals in local apprenticeship programs, what’s happening at the Cal Poly Technology Park and about a new local economic development organization taking shape currently called the Hourglass Project.

3. **Marketing/Branding Effort.**  
Faculty, staff and students are being invited to provide feedback on the Cal Poly brand. As part of an ongoing brand strategy effort, all faculty, staff and students will have the opportunity to give feedback on potential creative concepts related to the Cal Poly brand. Each member of the campus community will receive an email with a unique link to take an online survey reviewing potential logo and marketing material designs.

The survey will take about 15 minutes, and all feedback will be anonymous. The input of the campus community plays a critical role in informing an authentic brand that accurately reflects where Cal Poly is headed. University Marketing is leading the effort with higher education marketing firm SimpsonScarborough. The brand strategy process will also influence a redesign of the Cal Poly website.

4. **December 6th Campus Holiday Reception at the PAC.**  
President Armstrong and his wife, Sharon, will host a holiday reception for faculty and staff from 3:30-5:30 p.m. Thursday, Dec. 6, in the lobby of the Performing Arts Center's Christopher Cohan Center. Once again, in partnership with local nonprofit Jack's Helping Hand, guests are invited to bring a donation of a new, unwrapped toy or gift card (Amazon preferred) to the reception; or toy donations may also be made by shopping online on Jack’s Helping Hand’s wish list on Amazon. Faculty and staff spouses and partners are welcome to attend the reception.
Student Affairs Report to Senate  
December 4, 2018  
Keith Humphrey  
Vice President for Student Affairs

- The Assistant/Associate Dean of Students have seen a significant increase in case load. 828 students were supported in the 15-16 academic year increasing to 1297 students in the 17-18 academic year. These two staff members will be focusing on only the highest need students to effectively support the most complex student needs.

- Thank you to everyone on campus that has given to the gofundme account to support Lillianne Tang, the staff member in the Cross-Cultural Centers who was hit by a vehicle while crossing Monterey Street. The gofundme is still active as Lillianne’s recovery will be long, if you wish to donate.

- Student Affairs has raised over $21,000 to support Cal Poly students who have been impacted by wildfires throughout the state. Funds will help students manage their educational expenses. If you know students who have lost their home, parents lost their employment or other situations that can impact their education please refer them to the Dean of Students Office. We will continue to raise funds for this student need.
Statewide Senator Report  
December 4, 2018

[A] I have attached the resolutions that were presented at the November plenary. I wrote and presented the resolution: “A CALL FOR THE INCLUSION OF TUITION IN THE CAL GRANT B PROGRAM FOR FRESHMAN.” The Cal Grant program is fully funded and increasing each year. The Cal Grant B program is a needs based grant and currently does not fund tuition. This resolution is asking for tuition to be added to the grant.

[B] John Tarjan's "Campus Report" that he sends to all Senators.

[C] The faculty trustees' report on the November BOT meeting

[D] The paper "Artificial Intelligence Implications for Higher Education" by my colleague Simon Rodan. The Academic Affair Committee (AA committee) spent a lot of time discussing this paper and if degrees will become obsolete due to increased AI applications. The question is, "Should the CSU prepare for re-education 6 years after graduation.” It was a spirited debate and we did not come to a common conclusion.

There will be a number of searches for new Presidents at the CSU and those campuses want on campus interviews. This issue is not going away any time soon.

Jim LoCascio
EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF ATTRITION AND ENROLLMENT GROWTH ON THE NUMBER OF CSU STUDENTS

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the CSU to recognize that the emphasis on increasing graduation rates will not, by itself, lead to increasing the number of CSU graduates; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the CSU to recognize the impact of attrition on the number of CSU graduates; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the CSU to constitute a Task Force to identify strategies for and assess the cost of tracking students who are most at risk of leaving or who have left the CSU (voluntarily and involuntarily); and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU to allocate a portion of GI 2025 funding sufficient to implement the strategies identified by the Task Force to mitigate attrition in the CSU; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the CSU to expand its efforts to secure funding for significant FTES enrollment growth (beyond AUL increases); and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:
   - Chancellor White
   - EVC Blanchard
   - EVC Relyea
   - The Board of Trustees
   - CSU Campus Presidents
   - CSU Campus Provosts
RATIONALE: For the past two years, the CSU has been spending over $150 million to increase graduation rates, both to meet State requests to do so, but more fundamentally to address the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) position that to meet labor market projections in California, 480,000 more college graduates are needed from the CSU by 2030. Improving graduation rates to increase the number of graduates is costly and, most importantly, does not by itself increase the number of graduates (Stohs and Schutte, 2018). Indeed, improving graduation rates will likely have the opposite effect as, by definition, to do so means Average Unit Load (AUL) must increase, which given a constant budget, can only lead to decreasing enrollment (witness campus impactions and the 30,000 qualified students turned away from the CSU during the 2017–18 AY). In the long run, not only does enrollment potentially decrease, but so does tenure density, while placing increasing pressure on budgets and student faculty ratios.

Moreover, a focus on graduation rates tends to denigrate the broad diversity of life circumstances of CSU's students. For example, many CSU students enroll at a CSU because they are the first in their families to attend college. Discovering one's sense of self in the world higher education, regardless of any additional guidance provided, may in fact take longer than four years for such students. Other unintended consequences may easily occur. For example, impaction due in part to students taking higher AULs may reduce the enrollment of traditionally underserved students, or mismatches in college preparedness may lead to other groups of students performing poorly. While eliminating the equity gap is
A laudable and important goal, eliminating the equity gap while increasing graduation rates may lead to other unintentional and adverse consequences.

Since improving graduation rates does not by itself produce more students with degrees, the only means for increasing the numbers of graduates from the CSU is to increase enrollment, with concomitant increases in classes, faculty, and facilities to accommodate them. In the past five years, the CSU has received funds for only a 1-2% enrollment growth. In the 2018-19 budget, one-time funds were granted ($30 million per year for four years) which potentially gives rise to supporting a higher enrollment growth. However, since these are one-time funds, it is impossible to plan long-term to accommodate such growth without sacrificing much elsewhere, were these funds to end.

Even with such additional revenue, it will not be possible to attain the goal of an additional 40,000 graduates per year needed for 2030, as proposed by PPIC. The CSU should consider attrition as a factor impacting the number of graduates. As data suggests, a 1% decrease in the 20% or greater CSU attrition rate would lead to approximately 4,000 more graduates per year—a direct relationship, significantly more impactful than an increase in graduation rates. Currently, relatively little emphasis or money from GI 2025 or funds from any source, is spent understanding and mitigating the impact of attrition on the number of graduates.
A CALL FOR THE INCLUSION OF TUITION IN THE CAL GRANT B PROGRAM FOR FRESHMAN

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) encourage the California Legislature, the Governor of California, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the CSU Chancellor’s Office to work in concert to add tuition to the Cal Grant B awarded to low income freshman; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Legislative Analyst’s Office investigate the impact on student access, success, and the budget of the California State University (CSU) of not including tuition cost for freshman receiving a Cal Grant B; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

- The Governor of California,
- Committee on Education, California State Assembly,
- Senate Committee on Education, California State Senate,
- Chair, Assembly Budget Committee,
- Chair, California Senate Budget Committee,
- Paul Steenhausen, California State University Analyst, Legislative Analyst’s Office,
- Jennifer Kuhn, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst’s Office,
- CSU Board of Trustees,
- CSU Chancellor,
- CSU campus Presidents,
- CSU campus Senate Chairs,
- CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs,
- California State Student Association (CSSA),
- California Faculty Association (CFA),
RATIONALE: The Cal Grant was created in 1955 to help California families to afford higher education and is currently funded at $2.2 billion. This entitlement program is open to all California high school students attending any accredited and Cal Grant participating institution of higher education who meet certain income and GPA requirements. The Cal Grant B program is an income-based grant available to freshmen who have a minimum high school GPA of 2.0. For today's incoming freshman class, tuition is a major expense, and it especially impacts low income families. The lack of tuition award for the most vulnerable students during their first year of college impacts affordability, retention, and ultimately their academic success.

Higher Education Funding Per Full-Time Equivalent Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$21,374</td>
<td>$22,769</td>
<td>$23,723</td>
<td>$24,786</td>
<td>$25,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$12,494</td>
<td>$13,268</td>
<td>$13,858</td>
<td>$14,120</td>
<td>$14,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>$6,232</td>
<td>$6,442</td>
<td>$7,073</td>
<td>$7,897</td>
<td>$8,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Includes General Fund, fee revenue net of discounts, and local property taxes. In 2016-17, tuition discounts per full-time equivalent (FTE) student are projected to be $4,265 at UC, $1,676 at CSU, and $666 at CCC. Fee discounts at CCC are offset by Proposition 98 General Fund.

The CCC rates include Adult Education Block Grant funding of $446 per student in 2015-16 and $436 per student in 2016-17.

At UC and CSU, 1 FTE student represents 30 credit units for an undergraduate and 24 credit units for a graduate student. At CCC, 1 FTE student represents 525 contact hours per year, which on average generates about 24 credits.

Reflects unadjusted rates. Inflation (as measured by the state and local government price index) was 2.1 percent in 2013-14, 1.0 percent in 2014-15, 0.9 percent in 2015-16, and 2.5 percent in 2016-17.

Reference: https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/paying-for-college/financial-aid/types/Pages/cal-grants.aspx
INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE ELECTRONIC CORE COLLECTION (ECC)

1. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the CSU Council of Library Directors (COLD) is faced with major cuts to the Electronic Core Collection (ECC) due to inflation and lack of funding increases; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the Chancellor to increase the funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC), in order address increasing costs and continue to reap the advantages of collective purchasing power that saves the CSU $15 million annually; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution

- CSU Board of Trustees,
- CSU Chancellor,
- CSU campus Presidents,
- CSU campus Senate Chairs
- CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs,
- Council of Library Directors (COLD),
- CSU ERFSA, and the
- California State Student Association (CSSA).

RATIONALE: The ECC started in 1999 and in 2008, the Academic Senate of the California State University endorsed the Virtual Library AS-2854-08/AA of which the Electronic Core Collection (ECC) collection is part for CSU students and faculty. Since 2008, the budget has stagnated at $5 million with no augmentations in ten years. As a
result, due to increasing costs of information resources and inflation, the purchasing power of the ECC has diminished and information sources cut to keep within the budget.

The ECC allows all CSU students access to materials no matter the size and budget of their campus, which in turn leads to their success. Further, the value of this collection helps campuses meet accreditation standards of WASC in information literacy and critical thinking. Notably, fiscally this is the most efficient way to maintain library collections because this combined purchasing power saves the CSU an estimated $15 million, annually.

The ECC currently includes 52 online collections and databases (list attached). During the 2017-18 academic year, there were 17,774,233 full-text downloads from the CSU Libraries online resources by CSU students and faculty.

**Resources in the Electronic Core Collection**

- ABI Infrom (ProQuest)
- Academic Search Premier (EBSCO)
- Academic Complete eBooks (ProQuest)
- American Chemical Society Journal Archives
- American Council of Learned Societies
- America History and Life (EBSCO)
- Biological Abstracts (Thomson)
- CINAHL (EBSCO)
- Communication and Mass Media Complete (EBSCO)
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- CQ Researcher
- Digital Dissertations Package A (ProQuest)
- Ethnic NewsWatch
- GenderWatch
- Global Newsstream (ProQuest)
- Grove’s Music
- JSTOR Arts and Sciences (12 collections)
- Life Sciences Collection (JSTOR)
- MathSciNet
- Mergent Online
- Modern Language Association (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- NetLibrary (EBSCO)
- Oxford English Dictionary
- Project Muse Standard Collection
- PsycARTICLES (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- PsycINFO (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- Safari Tech Books (ProQuest)
- Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest)
- SpringerLink Online Historical Backfiles
- SCOAP3
- Westlaw: Campus Research – News and Life
- Wiley InterScience Backfile
- Wiley-Blackwell Backfile
MISAPPROPRIATION OF CSU FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BY COURSE HERO

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) find that Course Hero violates CSU campus policies and misappropriates faculty intellectual property by disseminating CSU faculty course materials without permission; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express serious concern that Course Hero threatens the integrity and value of CSU degrees by enabling cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty; and be it further,

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the CO demand that Course Hero cease and desist from misappropriating the course materials of CSU faculty;

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the CO develop and communicate to campus faculty a fillable PDF form with instructions which faculty may use to demand removal of their intellectual property from CH under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA); and be it finally

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

- Gregor Carrigan, CEO and Cofounder, Course Hero
- Andrew Grauer, CEO and Cofounder, Course Hero
- Deborah Quazzo, Managing Partner, GSV Accelerate
- CSU Board of Trustees,
• CSU Chancellor,
• CSU campus Presidents,
• CSU campus Senate Chairs,
• CSU campus Senate Executive Committees,
• CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs,
• CSU campus articulation officers,
• California Faculty Association (CFA)
• California State Student Association (CSSA)
• Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA)

RATIONALE: Course Hero (https://www.coursehero.com) provides a venue for people to upload materials from courses. Such materials include submitted student work, faculty grading keys, faculty exam questions, lecture notes, and other intellectual property.

Course Hero does not verify that their members have permission to upload materials.

Instead,

We rely on copyright holders and our users to flag any alleged copyright infringement so that we may promptly investigate the incident, protect copyrighted work, and ensure compliance with the DMCA. https://www.coursehero.com/copyright/#copyright_policy

While the site does provide a form for requesting the removal of materials, many CSU faculty may not be aware of the existence of Course Hero, be willing to register in order to search for their materials, or be able to locate the form.

Course materials are the intellectual property of individual CSU faculty and not owned by the CSU. Nonetheless, the CSU has a substantial interest in protecting the quality of instruction and the integrity of CSU degrees.
Therefore, this resolution requests that the CO use its legal expertise to simplify the
process for faculty enforcing their intellectual property rights.
REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT TO BE A FACULTY DISCIPLINE REVIEW GROUP (FDRG) MEMBER FOR THE CALIFORNIA COURSE-IDENTIFICATION (C-ID) PROCESS

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the following requirements for FDRG membership in the SB 1440 Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) development and review process:

   a. FDRG members shall be appointed from the ranks of tenured or tenure-track CSU faculty with broad experience in curriculum/articulation and expertise in the discipline of the potential Transfer Model Curricula.

   b. The majority of the CSU faculty appointed to a FDRG shall be tenured.

and be it further;

2. RESOLVED: The appointment of faculty to the FDRG be the purview of the Academic Senate CSU executive committee; and be it further,

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

   - C-ID leadership
   - Academic Senate CCC
   - CIAC listserv
   - ICAS membership
RATIONALE: To be developed...

Prior resolutions on the development of Transfer Model Curricula (see https://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/committees/apep/documents/APEP_2010-11_ANNUAL_REPORT.pdf) include:

AS-2972-10/APEP: Call for the Formation of a Joint CCC-CSU SB 1440 (Padilla)

Implementation Task Force on Transfer AA Degrees.

In anticipation of the Governor signing SB 1440 (Padilla) – now signed – calling for the creation of a transfer AA degree by California Community Colleges, this resolution calls for establishment of a joint CCC-CSU to oversee implementation of the degree. • Work on CCC transfer degrees (the new nomenclature is now AA-T & AS-T) is continuing.

Remaining issues concern advocating CCCs to incorporate American Institutions requirements (when possible), ensuring that CCC coursework meets the standards required for preparation for upper division work in the major (e.g., some courses submitted for the AA-T designation are neither TCSU nor C-ID approved), working on degree completion/tracking for the transfer degrees (and notification to the CSU), the development of "new" model curricula for majors that have not yet been developed, any review or revisitation of approved model curricula,

AS-2999-11/AA: Support for Faculty Collaboration in the Development of Model Transfer Degrees (SB 1440)

The ASCSU encourages active participation by discipline-specific faculty from both the CSU and the CCC in the development of transfer model curricula for purposes of
implementing SB 1440. The resolution also urges campuses and the Office of the Chancellor to provide needed funding for discipline faculty participate in the development of these degrees.
ADOPTION OF "TENETS OF SYSTEM LEVEL GOVERNANCE IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY"

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) adopt the document titled, "Tenets of System Level Shared Governance of the California State University," and its accompanying "Addendum"; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge its Executive Committee and members of the Chancellor's Office to abide by the principles and processes included in the "Tenets" document; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:
   - CSU Board of Trustees,
   - CSU Chancellor,
   - CSU campus Presidents,
   - CSU campus Senate Chairs,
   - CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs,
   - California State Students Association (CSSA),
   - California State Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (CSU ERFSA),
   - California Faculty Association (CFA),
   - American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and the
   - California Conference of the American Association of University Professors.

RATIONALE: In May 2018 the ASCSU Executive Committee introduced AS-3328-18/EX "Adoption of "Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University," which grew out of meetings between the Executive Committee and the
Chancellor’s Office leadership team about the state of faculty/administration relations during the 2017-18 year. The resolution died for lack of sufficient votes to waive the first reading. The ASCSU subsequently passed AS-3334-18/Floor “Appreciation for Conversations on System Level Shared Governance in the CSU”. That resolution urged the 2018-19 ASCSU to take up discussion of the “Tenets” document as an agenda item during the Fall 2018 session of the ASCSU. Based on that recommendation, the 2018-19 Executive Committee is introducing this resolution to place the Tenets document before the ASCSU as a regular agenda item.

Attachments:

1. AS-3334-18/Floor Appreciation for Conversations on System Level Shared Governance in the CSU

2. “Tenets of System Level Shared Governance of the California State University” “Addendum”

3. AS-3328-18/EX Adoption of “Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University”
NOTIFICATION OF CSU PARTIES INVOLVED IN A CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that the CSU Chancellor’s Office establish a procedure by which all members of the CSU community whose data are involved in a California Public Records Act (CPRA) request are informed of the request, of the nature of the information involved, as well as the data themselves; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That this be provided to all members of our academic community—students, faculty, staff, and administrators; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That this procedure be communicated to and implemented by all CSU campuses.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU recognizes the value and necessity of the California Public Records Act, while also recognizing the necessity and value of student, faculty, and staff privacy and the right of CSU community members to know what information about them has been shared with others. We encourage the Chancellor’s Office to work to strike a balance between the right of CSU members to maintaining privacy and the public’s right to know.
Faculty Trustee’s Report

CSU Board of Trustees Meeting — Nov. 13-14, 2018

Hereby I respectfully submit a summary of the Board of Trustees meeting. My report is largely based on the agenda materials provided to the trustees, on my personal notes from the meeting, and on my memory.

I tried my best to accurately reflect the deliberations, and I hope to have quoted correctly and paraphrased in the spirit of the speakers’ and presenters’ intentions. If you notice any inaccuracy or misrepresentation, please let me know (Romey.Sabalius@sjsu.edu).

Since the primary audience of this report is the faculty of the statewide academic senate (ASCSU), the focus is stronger on educational policies, legislative matters, state appropriations, and comments from the public than on other Board agenda items.

If you do not have enough time to digest the full report, you can just review the deliberations of the committees that interest you. Since at this meeting no action items were on the agenda of the Committee on Educational Policy, I assume that the 2019-2020 Operating Budget Request might be of the greatest interest in this report (page 6).

Romey Sabalius
Faculty Trustee

San José, CA — Nov. 25, 2018
Faculty Trustee’s Report

CSU Board of Trustees Meeting: Nov. 13-14, 2018

On Nov. 13 and 14, the CSU Board of Trustees meeting was held at the Chancellor’s Office of the California State University at 401 Golden Shore in Long Beach, California.

1. The Board of Trustees met on Tuesday morning in Closed Session to discuss Executive Personnel Matters and Pending Litigation.

2. The Committee on Collective Bargaining met in Closed Session.
   (Note: The Faculty Trustee is excused from deliberations of the Collective Bargaining Committee.)

The Public Meeting started on Nov. 13 at 9:45.

3. The Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds began with Public Comments. Martin Brenner from the CSU Employees Union (CSUEU) lamented that money intended for instruction is being diverted to address urgent facility needs.
   a. Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra San Juan presented the planned Sale of the State University House. It currently serves as the resident of the chancellor. Due to its age and extensive repair needs it is deemed to be more cost-effective to add the sale proceeds to the current endowment of approximately $2.1 million to generate a monthly stipend that would provide a housing allowance for the chancellor (to be addressed later in the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel).
   b. The information item on the California State Polytechnic University Pomona, Transfer of Real Property explained the intent to transfer 6 acres in the northeastern part of the campus to the California Highway Patrol. This is done in exchange for the receipt of 287 acres, known as the Lanterman Development Center.
   c. An information item explained the Humboldt State University, Acceptance of Interest in Real Property. The City of Arcata proposes to donate 884 acres of mostly forest land to the university as a living laboratory for the College of Natural Resources and Sciences.

Both are very welcomed land additions to our campuses with insignificant acquisition and maintenance costs.

4. The Committee on University and Faculty Personnel began with Public Comments. Several speakers criticized the 3% salary raise for campus presidents awarded at the July Board of Trustees meeting. Martin Brenner (CSUEU) criticized the hiring of temporary staff, which—in his opinion—constitutes no monetary gain, but a loss in worker quality.
   a. The committee received the Annual Report on Outside Employment for Senior Management Employees as an action item. For purposes of this policy, senior
management includes presidents, vice presidents, executive/vice chancellors, and the chancellor.

b. The committee received the *Annual Report on Vice President Compensation, Executive Relocation, and Executive Transition* as an information item.

c. The committee approved the item *Executive Compensation: Vice Chancellor of Human Resources*. New Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Evelyn Nazario, will receive an annual salary of $297,546 and a monthly auto allowance of $1,000 per month, which is the same compensation that outgoing Vice Chancellor Melissa Bard received.

d. The committee discussed and approved the *Chancellor's Housing Allowance* in the amount of $95,000 per year. This allowance comes from the State University House endowment and does not include any state funds (see Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds above).

5. The *Joint Committee on Finance and Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds* began with a Public Comment by Ejmin Hakobian, a former student at Cal State LA. This speaker was listed for comment to every committee and he appeared at almost every Board meeting during the past year. His many grievances mostly relate to alleged misuse of funds or discriminatory hiring decisions at Cal State LA.

a. The joint committee approved the *2019-2020 through 2023-2024 Five-Year Capital Plan and Multi-Year Financing Authorization*. "The Five-Year Capital Plan totals over $16 billion and is comprised of academic ($10 billion) and self-support projects ($6 billion)." 56 percent of our academic facilities are 40 years old or more, and the "cost to replace building and utility systems that have passed their useful life now approaches $3.7 billion." The plan is to address the facilities need with the issuance of bonds from existing operating funds (for a $1.1 billion bond) and anticipated operating funds (for another $1.2 billion bond), as well as with a general obligation bond on the 2020 ballot (an anticipated $8 to $10 billion to be split between the UC and the CSU).

b. The joint committee also approved to *Issue Board of Trustees of the California State University Systemwide Revenue Bonds and Related Debt Instruments and Amend the 2018-2019 Capital Outlay Program for the Acquisition of Real Property for Sonoma State University*. The generated funds will be used to purchase a newly constructed 90-unit multi-family housing facility ($42 million) for faculty and staff.

Trustee Sabalius expressed his hope that these apartments will be offered at below-market prices to the university’s workforce. Assistant Vice Chancellor Robert Eaton affirmed that “the [financing] calculations make the assumption to rent below market.”

6. The *Committee on Institutional Advancement* approved the

a. *Naming of the Don Miller and Ron Simons Rose Float Laboratory* at Cal Poly Pomona. The naming recognizes Wilford B. “Butch” and Vivien Lindley’s $1 million investment, which inspired additional donations in excess of $2.4 million for the project. “The replacement facility will be 5,800 gross square feet to house an
enclosed float construction laboratory, staging and testing spaces, a workshop, storage and restrooms." This gift will help students from a variety of academic disciplines to construct a float and to enter it in the annual Rose Parade on New Year's Day. "The Lindleys requested that the naming be in honor of Don Miller and Ron Simons, who were instrumental in Cal Poly Universities’ award-filled, 70-year Tournament of Roses legacy."

b. The committee also approved the Naming of the JUSTIN and J. LOHR Center for Wine and Viticulture at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. "The proposed naming of the facility recognizes the $2.5 million pledge by the Resnick Foundation and the $1 million gift and $1.5 million pledge by Jerome J. Lohr (Jerry Lohr). Their gifts and pledges of $2.5 million each will be used to fund the wine and viticulture center with an estimated completion date of fall 2019. The center will dramatically transform the Wine and Viticulture program within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences. Specifically, this project will provide a 15,600 square foot winery; a 12,000 square foot grange hall; crush, fermentation, barrel, sensory, bottling, enology and viticulture rooms; teaching and research labs; a bonded winery; offices; and community and industry meeting spaces."

7. The Committee on Educational Policy began with Public Comments. More than a dozen faculty and students from CSU Northridge criticized the Executive Orders 1100R and 1110. They fear the reduction and eventual demise of Ethnic Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and Queer Studies due to reduced student demand as a result of EO 1100R, which allows for double counting of GE courses and courses in the major. Several speakers accused the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees of "white supremacy," "colonialism," of establishing or tolerating "institutional racism and sexism," and of being "too white." Two speakers from the California Faculty Association (CFA), Mimi Bommersbach and Kevin Wahr, bemoaned that the CSU does not have enough counselors and mental health services. They claim that 4 in 10 CSU students report depressions, and that suicidal students have to wait weeks to be seen by counselors.

The committee received reports as information items on

a. Student Mental Health Services. The CSU is firmly committed to student success, and "student engagement and well-being is one of the six operational priorities driving the Graduation Initiative 2025." "According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, one in five adults in America experience mental illness in a given year." The results of the National College Health Assessment, in which nearly 22,000 CSU students participated, were presented. They show that demand for mental health services has increased since 2016 both in the CSU as well as nationwide. The CSU has increasingly hired counselors, whose numbers have increased from 140 in 2010 to 222 in 2018. In this time span, the counselor-to-student ration has gone down from approximately 1:3,000 to 1:2,000. This is a great improvement, but still short of the 1:1,500 ratio demanded in SB 968 (Pan), which however was vetoed by the governor (most likely because it was seen as an unfunded
mandate). CSU campuses offer a range of mental health services, as required by Executive Order 1053, such as

* Counseling/Psychotherapy
* Suicide and Personal Violence Services
* Emergency/Crisis Services
* Outreach
* Mental Health Consultation
* Referral Resources

In addition, there is a variety of campus-based programs. The CSU continues to "develop and strengthen partnerships with regional and local agencies and organizations to provide comprehensive care in cases where students' needs go beyond the campus' capabilities."

After the presentation, Trustee Hinton remarked that the request for $15 million in one-time funding will not be sufficient to hire permanent counselors.

b. **Student Veterans.** The "Troops to College" program benefits more than 21,000 military-affiliated students (student veterans, service members, and dependents).

c. **Graduation Initiative 2025.** Assistant Vice Chancellors James Minor and Jeff Gold reported that the graduation rates are on a consistent rise towards the 2025 targets:

(for brevity, I provide rounded numbers in % from 3 years ago / 2018 / target 2025)

* 4-year graduation (first-time students): 19 / 26 / 40
* 6-year graduation (first-time students): 57 / 61 / 70
* 2-year graduation (transfer students): 31 / 38 / 45
* 4-year graduation (transfer students): 73 / 77 / 85

The attempt to close equity gaps shows mixed results:

* Underrepresented Students of Color: 11.3 / 10.5 / 0
* Pell Grant Recipients: 8.6 / 9.5 / 0

Trustee Eisen stated that "increasing the graduation rate at the expense of the equity gap would have been easy. The heavy lifting is to make improvement on both." Trustee Nilon pointed out that "as rates improve, there is a cost to it," (an increase in the existing students' average unit load increases our FTES, but there is no additional tuition money), and he wondered "how campuses can be incentivized to stay the course." Trustee Meléndez de Santa Ana asked how the Chancellor's Office would "roll out the workgroup recommendations?" James Minor responded that there are 120 pages of recommendations and the CO will have to see how to frame them before they will be passed on to campuses.

8. The **Committee on Finance** began with **Public Comments.** Several members of Students for Quality for Education (SQE) demanded a "divestment from war," "more centers for all minorities," "a Dreamer resource center," and the removal of Gold Rush mascots (like "Pioneer Pete") that are "triggering for indigenous people." They pointed out that "certain segments of students have higher needs" and that "no one in California should go hungry." They also called for rescinding the executive pay increase and to freeze tuition. CFA leaders Jennifer Eagan and Lillian Taiz were pleased to see a bolder budget request that is much more in line with our needs. They praised the joint advocacy during the last
budget negotiations with the legislators and expressed the hope to do this again. They asserted that the legislators added funds to increase student enrollment and tenure density, but they expressed their disappointment that the FTES was raised by increasing the unit load of existing students instead of admitting new students. They are also concerned about the campuses’ uneven application of the $25 million for additional tenure-track hires. Representatives of the CSUEU, Martin Brenner and Tessy Reese, criticized the practice of contracting out when existing staff can do the job. They also pointed out that the Graduation Initiative 2025 increases demands on students and facilities and that it creates a greater need for mental health care.

a. The committee received the 2018-2019 Student Fee Report. Charts presented by Assistant Vice Chancellor Ryan Storm illustrated that both the undergraduate resident tuition ($7,303) as well as the graduate resident tuition ($8,737) at the CSU is the lowest in its group of peer institutions. In regards to non-residents, the CSU is second to last ($19,183). Category II Campus-Based Mandatory Fees range approximately from $1,000 to $2,000 per year, with the outliers on the top and on the bottom being San Luis Obispo ($4,074) and Fresno ($845).

Trustee Sabalious opined that in this case it should be “a point of pride to be at the bottom,” and that “the comparison to other institutions should not be used as an argument to increase the cost of education.” A debate ensued about out-of-state students. Trustee McGrory wondered why the non-resident tuition is still approximately 20% below our true cost per student, and Trustee Faigin was concerned that we “admit out-of-state students and shut out California students.” Trustee Taylor — on the other hand — explained that other university across the nation “aggressively recruit out-of-state students.” Chancellor White clarified that the “revenues for out-of-state students subsidize local students,” and that in particular international students “bring diverse perspectives” to our campuses that our local students benefit from.

b. The committee received the 2017 Systemwide Hate Violence Report. “In the 2017 calendar year there were a total of four reported incidents of hate violence on four campuses. Two of these incidents constituted a non-criminal act of hate violence.”

Trustee Hinton expressed her skepticism at the low number, and Trustee Simon surmised that many students do not report hate crimes. The CSU Chief of Police acknowledged that the number is “remarkably low, because the definition for hate crime is very narrow,” and that hate crimes off-campus are not included. He also assumed “that it is a very underreported crime.” Trustee Eisen requested data from previous years for comparison. There were 2 incidents in 2014, 10 in 2015, and 16 in 2016. These are similar to the numbers at the UC and spikes in election years are usual.

c. The committee received the Annual Investment Report. Assistant Vice Chancellor Robert Eaton explained that new legislation allows the CSU to invest up to 30% of its liquidity portfolio, which currently contains approximately $4 billion. It is expected that the increased flexibility will result in higher returns.

d. The committee received the proposed 2019-2020 Operating Budget Request from the Chancellor’s Office. It recommends an augmentation of $554.3 million to the CSU’s
base budget with the expectation of a 5% increase in enrollment. The additional enrollment would generate $98.3 million in tuition revenue. Therefore, the proposal would request $456 million as a recurring augmentation from the legislators. It would bring the 2019-2020 Operating Budget to a total of $7.32 billion, with $3.22 billion (44%) coming from tuition and $4.1 billion (56%) from the state. In addition, the proposal calls for one-time funds of $15 million for the CSU Basic Needs Initiative to address student food and housing insecurities and $250 million for deferred maintenance.

As at the Board meeting in September, Trustee Sabalius again called for $1 billion in one-time funding. He understands the concern of the CO staff that such a high demand could call the CSU’s credibility into question. However, he believes that actually the opposite would be the case. “We would lose credibility if we claim that our deferred maintenance costs total $3.7 billion and subsequently only ask for $250 million to address these monumental needs.” Ryan Storm explained that the base budget request included $80 million for facilities and infrastructure needs. This amount marks an increase of $30 million from the September proposal. The intent is to use these reoccurring funds to service a $1.2 billion bond to address deferred maintenance.

Trustee McGrory asked whether the CSU still intends to place a large general obligation bond measure on the ballot. Trustee Sabalius stressed that one budget line item should not preclude the other, and he advocated for a “three-pronged approach,” which should include one-time funds, reoccurring funds for a facilities bond, and a general obligation bond in the future. He expressed his concern that the currently robust economy might soon experience a correction, if not even enter into a recession. Since higher education and corrections are funded from only 10% of discretionary money within the state budget, any change in the flow of tax revenues would exponentially affect the sums available for distribution by legislators to the CSU (usually approximately 2.5% of the state’s general fund appropriations).

Chancellor White remarked that the low demand “does not mean that the needs are insignificant,” but “needs are everywhere” and the CSU should not become “incredible” in their budget request. He urged the Board to adopt the budget request as proposed by the CO staff. Trustee Sabalius’ suggestion to request $1 billion in one-time funding for deferred maintenance was voted down by members of the Finance Committee.

The Board adjourned the Tuesday meeting shortly after 5 pm.
The Board reconvened on Wednesday, Nov. 14 at 8:30 am.

9. The Committee on Governmental Relations received the
   a. State Legislative Update. Assistant Vice Chancellor Kathleen Chavira reported that
      her staff tracked over 400 legislative proposals of which 14 were enacted and 5
      vetoed. Among the enacted bills was only one that the CSU opposed (AB 2505),
      which requires an annual report “comparing the hiring practices of the UC and CCC.”
      Among the vetoes bills were several that would have established unfunded mandates
      (SB 320-Abortion by Medication Techniques, SB 968-Mental Health Counselors,
      AB 1231-Staff Merit Salary Adjustments, and AB 2477-Dream Resource Liaisons).

10. The Committee on Audit started with one Public Comment. Gina Voight (CSUEU)
     bemoaned safety violations on several campuses and asserted that staff is not given the
     proper safety training and equipment.
     a. The committee received the Status Report on Current and Follow-up Internal Audit
        Assignments by Larry Mandel, Vice Chancellor and Chief Audit Officer. “For the
        2018 year, assignments were made to develop and execute individual campus audit
        plans; conduct audits of Information Technology (IT), Sponsored Programs and
        Construction; implement continuous auditing techniques; and to provide advisory
        services and investigation reviews. Follow-up on current and past assignments was
        also being conducted on approximately 35 completed campus reviews.”

11. The Committee on Collective Bargaining began with Public Comments. Several
     members of the CSU Employees Union (CSUEU) stressed the importance of “working
     collaboratively” and “to act in good faith” when bargaining. Since both the Chancellor’s
     Office and the union work towards the same goal to make our campuses safe and
     function well, “we really should not be in opposition.”
     a. The committee ratified the Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with
        Bargaining Unit 11, the United Auto Workers, Local 4123 (UAW), which represents
        teaching associates and graduate assistants. The contract will run to September 30,
        2020 with a 3% general salary increase in 2018 and 2019. The time for vesting to be
        entitled to full retiree medical and dental care was increased from 5 years to 10 years
        for new employees.

12. The Plenary Session began with Public Comments. William Blischke, President of
     ERFSAL, gave his informal report, also stressing the importance of mental health
     counseling, and—as in previous meetings— he promoted a shoe collection initiative to
     benefit the homeless (Soles4Souls). Members of the CSUEU again criticized the practice
     of “contracting out,” which is “only allowed as long as there is no displacement” of
     current employees. They also worried about “reclassification” of employees and
     demanded updated and clear classifications. The mother and brother of David Josiah
     Lawson, a student at Humboldt who was killed in 2017 at an off-campus party, lamented
     that the murder is still unsolved. Charmaine Michelle Lawson thanked Chancellor White
     and Chair Day for visiting the Humboldt campus and for speaking with her personally.
Several students asserted that in the rural community of Arcata, “students of color are routinely put into harm’s way, especially African American students.” They proclaimed that “the Redwood Curtain is a trap” and that “genocide and colonialism are alive.”

The Board received the following Reports:

a. The Chair of the Board of Trustees, Adam Day, reported about his visit to Humboldt State, and that he had now visited all 23 CSU campuses in his role as trustee. He is optimistic about the projected 5% increase in enrollment, and he praised the many election drives on campuses.

b. Chancellor Timothy White said that in the face of deadly shootings and devastating wildfires, “we have to up our game in showing compassion.” Our goal is “to grow and prosper without being dismissive of others.” “If we can do it in crises, we can do it in good times,” and he is optimistic that we can “create a just and compassionate tomorrow.”

c. The Chair of the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU), Catherine Nelson, presented resolutions passed at the senate’s November meeting, among them one that calls on the Board of Trustees to announce the finalists of presidential searches and to invite them for campus presentations to preserve transparency and full input by all stakeholders. Chair Nelson also underscored that the many protests by the students “call into question the Graduation Initiative 2025 and the Executive Orders.” She urged the CSU leadership to “look at the consequences of our action and see if they match up with our intentions.”

d. The President of the California State Student Association (CSSA), Mia Kagianas, also spoke about the students’ success in registering voters. She further expressed CSSA’s support for the $15 million budget request for student basic needs.

e. The President of the CSU Alumni Council, Manolo Morales, applauded the “amazing success of the Graduation Initiative 2025.” The council is preparing a “tool-kit” for alumni on how to engage with the CSU, and they will have an alumni meeting in London for the first time.

At Trustee Hinton’s request the approval of the 2019-2020 Operating Budget Request was taken off the consent agenda, and she made the motion to request $15 million for the CSU Basic Needs Initiative as a reoccurring item to the operating budget, instead of as one-time funds, since student food and housing insecurities are problems that will not go away in the coming years. After an intensive debate, the motion was voted down.

To close the session, the Board approved all resolutions that were previously passed in the various committees.

The Board of Trustees meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, Nov. 14, shortly after 11 am. A planned Closed Session on Executive Personnel Matters was postponed until the January meeting.
1. **Chair Nelson** referred us to her written report distributed last night. Chair Nelson’s current and past chair reports can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/)

2. **Excerpts from Other Reports**
   - **Academic Affairs** discussed the following topics.
     - Artificial Intelligence and its potential impact on curriculum
     - Observing the 20th Anniversary of the center for community engagement
     - Call for inclusion of tuition in Cal Grant B for freshman
     - Closing the achievement gap
     - Data-based decision making
     - Augmentation of Student Success White Paper
     - Immigration status of students
     - Need for C-ID course reviewers
     - Alternative faculty appointments
     - Use of standardized tests in admissions
     - Funding for the Electronic Core Collection
   - **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
     - Update on the WestEd study looking at implementation of EO 1110
     - Disciplinary councils
     - Negative publicity about teacher education programs across the country
     - Proposal for a 4th (senior) year of quantitative reasoning in the a-g admissions standards
     - Proposal for a 3rd year of science in the a-g requirements (being considered by the UC also)
     - Update on student progress/classifications under the new EO 1110 structure
     - Resolutions (see below)
       - C-ID CORE faculty (course reviewers)
       - C-ID FDRG membership (in charge of maintaining discipline transfer curriculum)
       - Discipline council support
       - Commendation of Bechtel Corporation (January)
   - **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.
     - State budget allocation to support unconscious bias training
     - Allocation of $25m for tenure-track hiring
     - Appointment of clinical faculty (tenure-track with little or no scholarly activity expectations)
     - Presidential search process
     - Course Hero (posting of course materials)
     - Request for instructor/grade information
     - EO 1100 and 1110 implementation
   - **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
     - Directory of who ASCSU legislative representatives are, including who represents the areas served by satellite campuses
     - White paper on student success
     - Planning for lobbying
Tracking of legislation
- Tuition
- Campus budget allocations

- **GE Advisory Committee** discussed the following issues.
  - Results of a survey of history chairs asking advice on units granted for AP modern history.
  - CCC Online College update (workforce, non-baccalaureate preparation)
  - GE Task Force report
  - Review of campus survey on best practices in GE assessment—will be looking at campus GE curriculum maps
  - Standardization of GE across the system as a result of EO 1100(rev.) implementation.

- **Senator Soni Report on ASCCC Plenary Meeting** He highlighted the following topics discussed at the plenary.
  - The CCC Online College has no CEO and no faculty named yet.
  - There is a new CCC funding formula that includes incentives based upon student success. (Base plus enrollment, allocation based upon low income students, allocation based upon success) This may eventually move to a 60-20-20% breakdown.
  - Guided Pathways [http://cccgp.cccco.edu/](http://cccgp.cccco.edu/)

3. **Faculty Trustee Sabalius** reported on the GI 2025 conference. The Board met in its annual retreat the day before. There was disappointment expressed that the ASCSU Chair was not invited to attend. This practice may be reconsidered next year. He reported on his busy schedule since our last plenary, including many campus visits and meetings with faculty across the state. We anticipate a supplemental budget “ask” to the legislature of an additional $456m. This would address deferred maintenance, student basic needs and enrollment growth of 5%. There is an increasing awareness of the magnitude of the CSU’s deferred maintenance problem. It is important to advocate for major increases in budget augmentation while the economy is healthy. He continues to argue for a deferred maintenance augmentation of at least $1b. Deferred maintenance has a negative impact on student success. We need working, accessible infrastructure. Faculty Trustee reports can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml)

4. We commended former Chair Chris Miller who is leaving our body to assume an administrative position on her Sacramento campus.

5. We passed the following resolution upon second reading. Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/).
   - Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement, and Student Success in Service Learning and Community Engagement is self-explanatory.

6. We passed the following resolutions after waiving a second reading. Normally first reading items are distributed to campuses for feedback. However, if the ASCSU deems an item to be urgent (e.g. the need to provide input before a policy or piece of legislation is being considered) it may waive the second reading. Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/).
a. **Requirements for Appointment of Course Outline of Record (COR) Evaluators for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process** establishes criteria and a process for the appointment of CSU reviewers of CCC courses submitted for inclusion in CCC Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Tenured, tenure-track and full-time lecturer faculty and FERP faculty with expertise in curriculum and articulation are eligible for appointment by the CSU Executive Committee. The delay in appointing CSU course reviewers has hindered the approval of campus ADTs, preventing students from utilizing this preferred avenue for transfer. CCC leadership has been urging expediting of this process for some time now.

b. **Presidential Search Process in the California State University System: Announcement of Finalists and Visitors to Campuses** argues for a return to the practice of conducting open searches for campus presidents. The ASCSU wanted to offer advice in time to inform the coming presidential searches this academic year.

7. We introduced the following resolutions that will be considered for adoption at our January plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
   a. **Adoption of “Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University”** is self-explanatory. (See text at the end of this report.)
   b. **Misappropriation of CSU Faculty Instructional Materials by Course Hero** opposes the use of faculty intellectual property by this entity without the permission of the faculty members affected. It asserts that this misappropriation enables academic dishonesty.
   c. **A Call for the Inclusion of Tuition in the Cal Grant B Program for Freshman**
   This program currently does not provide funds to low-income freshmen to cover tuition.
   d. **Increased Funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC)**
   Not only is this collection used by all 23 campuses, but this approach to acquisitions continues to save our campuses significant resources every year.
   e. **Notification of CSU Parties Involved in a California Public Records Act Request** requests that the CSU keep the appropriate individuals informed when requests under the CPRA may affect them.
   f. **Closing the Achievement Gap and Increasing College Completer Outcomes and Success for All CSU Students** supports this goal, commends the CSU’s commitment to achieving this goal, applauds the GI 2025 initiative for its commitment to the goal, commends the ITL for its support in reaching this goal, lists factors affecting equity, and asks that additional analyses be conducted to look at equity in other outcomes such as major selection and employment experiences after graduation.
   g. **Encouraging Responsible Curriculum Development and Modification Under HEERA**
   Asserts that research supports our system’s previous approach to remediation and that too much focus on graduation rates may result in some negative consequences, reiterates a concern about flawed approaches to shared governance evidenced in the development and implementation of EOs 1100(rev.) and 1110, encourages campus senates to assert their control over the curriculum, and encourages the CSU administration to engage in data-driven and genuine consultation regarding the future of these two executive orders.
   h. **Requirements for Appointment to be a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) Member for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process** clarifies the criteria and process for these appointments. These individuals oversee
the Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) that can be incorporated into CCC campus Associate Degrees for Transfer and the content of the courses which populate these degrees.

i. **Creation of California State University Discipline Councils** encourages the Chancellor's Office to maintain contact lists of appropriate faculty for all disciplines for which a Transfer Model Curriculum exists and support electronic communications for those groups and to support the formation of discipline councils for those groups, similar to the Math and English Councils.

j. **Examining the Impact of Attrition and Enrollment Growth on the Number of CSU Students** asserts that increasing graduation rates, in and of itself, may not increase the number of graduates over time, encourages the CSU to recognize the impact of student attrition, urges the creation of a task force to examine student attrition, and supports the request of additional state funding to fully support an increase in the number of students served by the CSU. Background information related to this resolution can be found at https://www.dropbox.com/s/id9eesiaq7mnyqy/Stohs-Schutte%20-%20Oct%202018%20Grad%20Rate%20Myth.pdf?dl=0

8. **Jennifer Eagan (CFA Liaison) reported the following.**
   - **Election Update**
     - All but 2 CFA-endorsed candidates were elected with the possible exception of two people in races still too close to call (State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Insurance Commissioner).
     - CFA was out of force at the Newsome election celebration. Many students also attended.
     - Proposition 10 failed despite CFA endorsement.
     - Most CFA-endorsed senate candidates were elected or may be elected when final vote tallies come in.
     - CFA-endorsed candidates did well in assembly races. Several races still do not have definitive results.
     - We had a great partnership with the CSU administration, CSSA and others. Given that success, it was disappointing to see executive compensation increases being taken up by the Board so soon after our budget became final.
   - We are closely monitoring how the $25m for new hires is being allocated/spent.
   - Our contract runs out in 2020. While we are grateful for the raises under this contract, we are still “digging out of a compensation hole” dating back to before the big budget cuts. We are trying to educate faculty of the need to continue our strong efforts to address faculty issues. Bargaining has never been easy in this system.
   - CFA is working on a paper on tenure density. We expect it to be released in June. Lecturer conversion to tenure-track positions, the impact of decreases in tenure-track counselors, etc. are issues currently being discussed.

9. **Alumni Trustee John Nilon** shared his personal story of being an undergraduate in the CSU. He intended to transfer from college in Colorado to UCSB but had his admission delayed a term. He attended CSC, Bakersfield for 10 weeks prior to transfer. His great experience with the faculty in Bakersfield led him to remaining there to finish his degree. He expressed his belief that we have a very special faculty in the CSU. His wife had a similar experience with her CSU professors. Two of his children are alums and the third hopes to attend CSUSM next year. **In response to questions/comments:** In at least
some cases, it appears that open presidential searches result in a smaller pool of candidates than do closed searches. The search firm we have used assures us that this is the case across the country. He will work to help collaboration between the administration and faculty be even more effective. He will look into the issues surrounding the use of non-tenure-track faculty and tenure density. He addressed both our relationship with the legislature and our funding challenges. We may need to focus more attention on advocacy efforts at the legislative district level. Alumni can be a key component in building momentum for adequate funding for the CSU. He will ask the Chancellor about the status of the proposed task force on tenure/alternative types of appointment. We need to do a better job of maintaining email addresses for our graduates. He is very interested in student mental health issues and the need to do a better job of getting young men of color to attend our campuses. The state is considering a bond issue which might bring us $4b to deal with deferred maintenance. However, unless the state pays off the bond, this will not help much with our funding challenges. Faculty diversity is an important topic for the CSU. We need to do a better job of concisely communicating what the CSU means to the state in terms of workforce development. We need to balance efficiency with effectiveness in what we do. We may want to consider the idea of designating all campus alcohol sales-related revenues go to funding student services, especially mental health services.

10. EVC Loren Blanchard began by lamenting the unfortunate and senseless shootings of young people, including college students, that took place last night in Thousand Oaks. CSU students were involved. We are putting our inter-campus cooperation plan into effect to assist CSU, Northridge in any way needed including counseling of students. Next week the Board will be focusing on student mental health. We are partnering with local and regional support services to increase our ability to meet student needs. Student basic needs (food, housing) will also be addressed. We will provide an update on the services we offer to our military veterans. We have over 21,000 service members, veteran's, and service family members attending the CSU. The Board will get an update on the GI 2025. We are proud of the number of students who are achieving a quality degree from the CSU. Our 4-year graduation rates have improved from 23% to 25% over the past year, the 6-year rate from 59 to 61, 2-year transfer student rate 35% to 38%, and the 4-year transfer student rate 75% to 78%. The URM graduation gap decreased from 12.2% to 10.5% and the Pell-eligible gap decreased from 12.6% to 9.5% over that same period.

GI 2025 workgroups continue their work. There is broad representation from across our system on these groups. They have done a great job in outlining some priorities for the coming years. Four foci going forward include:

- Campus implement of student preparation initiatives.
- Framework for student care and well-being.
- Increasing student course loads.
- Improving advising.

Note: Board meetings are livestreamed: [https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees](https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees)

Dr. Blanchard addressed the public information request about faculty information and course grades. Our counsel's office has negotiated what we feel is a more reasonable request. Chair Nelson was thanked for her role in this process. We have a committee on technology and on-line education. It replaces other committees. It is focused on increasing student access. This committee will begin meeting later this month. The
committee is composed of administrators from across the system, the ASCSU Executive Committee, and the CSSA President.

In response to questions about: The Interpretation of EO 1100 (rev.): We hope to help campuses be responsive to EO 1100 and align with system expectations without being overly prescriptive. Faculty Development Opportunities for Lecturers: The faculty representatives involved in overseeing those programs should be consulted on those issues.

11. AVC Ryan Storm and Director Kara Perkins made a presentation about the CSU budget. They began with a historical review. The numbers are grim. We have lost a lot of buying power over the past 14 years. Real (adjusted for inflation) budget per student has dropped significantly. The holes in our budget from 6 years ago have not been filled even as our allocation has grown. Expenses per student are significantly lower than at our comparison institutions and a fraction of what they are at UC. We are VERY efficient (unfortunately). Our students graduate with significantly less debt than the national average. The base budget supplement request/projection has $75m for the Graduation Initiative, $206.1m for 5% enrollment growth, $147.8 for employee compensation increases (approximately 3% increase), $80m for academic facilities and infrastructure needs and $45.4m for mandatory cost increases (health care benefits, retirement contributions, etc.) for a total of $554.3m. We are asking the state for a general fund increase of $456m and expect a $98.3m increase student fund revenue (based on 5% enrollment increase) for the total of $554.3m. The system anticipates also asking for a one-time funding augmentation of $15m to meet student basic needs and $250m for deferred maintenance. As soon as the Board approves a budget request, advocacy will begin in earnest. Capital financing options for the state/CSU were reviewed. The best solution for the CSU might be for the state to put additional debt service funding into our base budget and allow us to borrow and repay our own construction funds. This would be a cheaper and faster alternative to having the state issue general obligation or lease-revenue bonds. Many technical questions regarding lobbying strategies, capital funding, recurring vs. one-time funding, etc. were asked and thoroughly answered. Of note is the possibility that if we ever make a pitch for a major increase in capital funding, this may be an opportune year with a new state administration taking office and a relatively robust economy.

12. Joe Nino (CSSA Chair) CSSA has been focused on voter registration and turnout. They are now refocusing their attention on their legislative/advocacy agenda. CSSA was glad to attend the GI 2025 conference and hopes that we can do things to remove the student success equity gap. Campuses are encouraged to nominate individuals for consideration for the student trustee position. CSSA is working with our sister segments' students to ensure adequate financial aid is available to all deserving students. They are preparing to weigh in on the proposed CSU executive compensation policy.

13. James Swartz (ERFSA Liaison) ERFSA is working with the CO to create better links across campuses. They are discussing our current tuition structure which is based upon unit tiers rather than units. Note: ERFSA provides many very valuable resources for retired and nearly-retired CSU employees. The website is particularly valuable. http://csuerfa.org/
Tenets of System Level Shared Governance in the California State University

The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) and the Chancellor affirm their commitment that joint decision making is the long-accepted manner of shared governance at the system level.\(^1\) Shared governance refers to the appropriately shared authority, responsibility and cooperative action among governing boards, administration and faculty in the governance and accountability of an academic institution.\(^2\)

The Constitution of the ASCSU establishes the purpose of the systemwide senate, as well as the means of consultation and decision making by which the senate will act.\(^3\) Both the ASCSU and the chancellor recognize there will be areas of consultation and decision making in which one party or the other will have primary responsibility.\(^4\) In the case of the faculty, primacy includes academic programs, curricula, methods of instruction, and areas of student life that directly relate to the educational process.\(^5\) In these areas the ASCSU is the formal policy-recommending body on systemwide academic and curricular policy and matters that directly impact them; it is also the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions.\(^6\) The authority of the faculty in these areas derives from its recognized expertise in academic matters. The chancellor maintains administrative responsibility for the institution. The chancellor shares responsibility for the defining and attaining of systemwide goals, which may include goals for the educational program, and the communication that links all components. In the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators.\(^7\) Both parties accept the fiduciary and governing authority of the Board of Trustees of the California State University ultimately to set policy. For the CSU, consultation must take place with the ASCSU in areas of faculty primacy described above. This primacy means the faculty voice is given the greatest weight, although the authority for the final decision resides in the Office of the Chancellor. In areas of faculty primacy, recommendations of the faculty are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.\(^8\)

Consultation and mutual respect are key components of shared governance. Effective consultation and joint decision making result in decisions that better serve the CSU and its students. While discussions may take place in different forms with other constituencies, faculty consultation means that there is an established process of deliberation that offers a means for the faculty—either as a whole or through authorized representatives—to develop and provide formal input in advance of decision making on the particular issue under consideration. System level policy affecting faculty primacy areas shall result from consultation between the chancellor and the ASCSU. Joint decision
making in these areas results from effective consultation, as characterized below. While the ASCSU
serves as the official voice of the faculty on systemwide issues, campus senates serve as the official
voice of their respective faculty. Consistent with the precepts of this document, but not expressly
addressed herein, campuses have their own relationships with the Office of the Chancellor. A
normative culture of meaningful consultation must be characterized by:

- openness and transparency;
- commitment to civility, integrity, respect and open communication;
- mutual responsibility for decisions;
- trust, including trust of good intentions;
- a commitment to responsible participation on the part of all parties;
- a respect for evidence-based deliberation;
- a recognition of established best practices and promising new data-driven practices in the
evaluation of subjects under consideration; and
- a recognition that consultation must allow both parties the time to consider, debate, develop
their responses and work toward consensus while recognizing the need to proceed in a timely
manner.

In accordance with the above described culture of consultation, any plan or policy that could
affect faculty primacy areas and that may actually or potentially result in an executive order, shall be
provided in draft form to the ASCSU body (or Executive Committee if during the summer), allowing
for a reasonable review period (normally expected to approximate 75 days). If requested by the
Executive Committee, additional extensions to obtain feedback may be authorized by mutual
agreement. Each party recognizes that there will be occasional circumstances in which time constraints
do not allow for normal systems of consultation to work effectively. The formal consultation process
will therefore make provision to allow for an explicit agreement between the ASCSU and the
chancellor to engage in a mutually agreed-upon process of expedited consultation in such cases, while
still recognizing the formal role of the academic senates as the faculty voice on the matters under
consideration. In the unlikely event that agreement cannot be reached, the chancellor will decide.
Because an expedited process is not the most optimal form of consultation and shortchanges a robust
shared governance process, its use should be limited to those rare circumstances that justify departing
from the more comprehensive process intended by this document.

Ultimately, genuine consultation based on sound reasoning occurs only in such a time and
manner that each party has a reasonable opportunity to affect the decision being made.
In California, the faculty role in shared governance and the centrality of joint decision making in that process is clarified in the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA); HEERA was to establish collective bargaining for faculty at CSU to insure that in doing so, traditional shared governance practices are not inhibited or undermined: "The Legislature recognizes that joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this chapter to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit, or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices..."

[1] https://www. perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.aspx#ST3560


[8] Report of the Board of Trustees’ Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University. Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, September 1985.

Addendum

This document resulted from a series of meetings between members of the ASCSU Executive Committee (Christine Miller, Catherine Nelson, Simone Aloisio, Thomas Krabacher, and Robert Keith Collins) and members of the leadership team at the Office of the Chancellor (Timothy White, Loren Blanchard, Christine Mallon, James Minor and Leo Van Cleve). The meetings took place during the 2017-18 academic year, and culminated in mutual agreement on May 8, 2018.

The following definitions aided in the crafting of this document:

Chancellor: For the purpose of this document the Chancellor refers broadly to the functions assigned to the Chancellor and the staff who work in the Office of the Chancellor.

The following definitions are used by the American Association of University Professors and the American Conference of Academic Deans in surveys of higher education governance in 1970 and 2001. (1)

"Consultation: Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board."

"Discussion: Discussion means that there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or from individual faculty members; or that there is formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees."
(1) https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/97F85F15-0C93-4F2D-8291-E0E3DAC00329/0/01surv.pdf
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This paper raises the question: what will be the impact of recent advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI) on higher educational program offerings? According to some estimates, AI will change 30% of the underlying activities in over 60% of jobs in the United States. Some of those may be jobs for which universities such as ours are currently preparing their students. Adapting to this new landscape may, in some cases, necessitate changes in what degree programs teach, and may well require a re-imagining of the post secondary educational model and the role of the University, and the services it provides, in society.
Introduction

In the first part of this paper, we provide some historical context, noting the original thinking and policies around globalization, employment and education. In the second section, we consider the implications of AI on higher education, and the final section suggest possible next steps. This is not a rigorous academic paper, is somewhat speculative, and is intended simply as a starting points for discussion, reflection and ultimately, action.

Historical Context

The Promise of the Knowledge Economy

The mid-1980s saw a rise in prominence of free markets and a concerted move towards the lowering of trade barriers. As international trade opened up, the globalization of manufacturing supply chains led to the offshoring of a large number of manual jobs to lower-wage developing countries. The policy response in Europe and the US was predicated on the notion of the “knowledge economy”\(^1\); that if manual labor was migrating to other countries, jobs that required greater levels of education would take their place. This led to a push for ever larger numbers of high school graduates to attend university. At the same time, emphasis shifted from vocational training to a university style education\(^2\). A bachelor’s degree came to be seen not as something for a fortunate few, but as a prerequisite for jobs in the knowledge economy.

Two things were missing from that vision of the future; first it underestimated the strength of higher education in many of the countries that had been considered “developing”, in particular India and China. The notion that the developed countries’ educational systems were a source of comparative advantage may well have been wishful thinking. Second, it did not anticipate the rapid advances in artificial intelligence that are likely to change drastically the employment landscape. In the first decade of the 21st century, the mantra that knowledge work would be the panacea to save the developed economies from the adverse effects of globalization ran aground on the realization that developing countries were likely to be able to compete in the space that the developed countries had considered their preserve. The prospect that many knowledge-related middle class jobs might be as susceptible to offshoring as had been the manual ones that had moved overseas at the end of the 20th century, led to a new framing; the notion of the “innovation economy” was born.

With much the same the same hubris that underpinned the conceit of the knowledge economy, the innovation economy was touted as being the rightful domain of pre-eminence of the developed economies. Carly Fiorina, ex-Hewlett-Packard CEO, epitomized this thinking: “I have been doing business in China for decades, and I will tell you that yeah, the Chinese can take a test, but what they can’t do is innovate,” she said. “They are not terribly imaginative. They’re not

---
\(^1\) The adaptive potential of labor markets is still a widely-held belief.
\(^2\) In Britain, for example, polytechnics, which had historically offered vocational training, were re-branded as universities.
entrepreneurial, they don't innovate, that is why they are stealing our intellectual property\(^3\). While this seems a dubious claim\(^4\)\(^5\)\(^6\), relying on creativity as our last refuge in the post-industrial revolution is probably another misplaced act of faith. America may not have as much protection from competition, both in labor markets and in the product markets that it has dominated in the last several decades, as some hope. There is thus no magic bullet, no 'American Exceptionalist' refuge from the impact of AI. Moreover, AI may not just replace people in rote, routine knowledge-related tasks; it will replace people in activities that rely on creativity as well.

How AI is Changing the Landscape

It is over 20 years since DeepBlue, an IBM chess-playing computer, beat chess grandmaster Gary Kasparov\(^7\). The recent victory of 'AlphaGo', an AI program developed by Google, over the world's top Go player\(^8\) provides more recent, and perhaps more compelling evidence that AI can solve highly complex strategic problems of a kind that had been considered analytically intractable and therefore amenable only to human intuition. Not only will activities that require computation and the application of knowledge be at risk from AI; medical diagnostics, once considered more of an art than a science is becoming much more automated\(^9\)\(^10\)\(^11\)\(^12\).

White-collar jobs, requiring years of training, could in the future be performed by a computer, possibly with greater accuracy than by humans. Beyond inference from 'big data' and image interpretation, AI may even prove to be capable of creative tasks, attacking that last bastion of human endeavor thought to be safe from mechanisation. As BusinessWeek reported recently, AI is beginning to generate creative artifacts that could easily be mistaken for the work of little known Impressionists\(^13\), 'artem ex machina'.

According to a recent study by McKinsey\(^14\), a management consultant, "The impact [of AI] will be felt not just by factory workers and clerks but also by landscape gardeners and dental lab technicians, fashion designers, insurance sales representatives, and even CEOs". The study continues; "about 60 percent of all occupations have at least 30 percent of activities that are technically automatable, based on currently demonstrated technologies". In another report\(^15\),

---

3: http://fortune.com/2015/05/26/carly-fiorina-china-innovation/
6: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/02/these-charts-show-how-china-is-becoming-an-innovation-superpower/
7: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/20-years-after-deep-blue-how-ai-bas-advanced-since-conquering-chess/
McKinsey notes that economic pressure driving AI adoption. The extent of the economic disruption is perhaps unprecedented both in its scale and in the speed with which change may occur. A successful AI algorithm written by just one person, and which can be easily scaled, can supplant an activity employing hundreds or thousands of people. Not only is the scale of the disruption potentially seismic, the speed at which it is arriving may be much faster than we expect. Google's Director of Strategic Planning for People Operations, Harlan Findley, believes that self-driving trucks will replace all manually operated long-haul trucks within two to three years. And while not all jobs may be affected quite so rapidly—McKinsey notes that the cost of automation, the supply of cheap labor, and regulation will also play a role in slowing AI's adoption for knowledge work—the study concludes that 50% of all today's work activities may be automated within 20 years. While that may seem relatively distant, some jobs will be affected sooner than others as in the case of the trucking industry and medical diagnostics. It is not too soon to start thinking about what these changes mean for higher education.

Implications for Higher Ed

Degree Programs
Just as certain jobs may comprise activities that are differently vulnerable to replacement by AI, not all programs will be equally affected. As noted, while some aspects of medicine may soon be radically transformed by AI, others, such as the BA or MA in Art History and Visual Culture or the minor in Ancient and Medieval History, may be more immune. Those degree programs that may be most impacted should begin to consider how their program content and pedagogy may need to change and adapt once they understand which activities they are training students in are most susceptible to AI replacement. Programs may need to eliminate some parts of what they currently teach, and adapt others to incorporate AI into their programs.

Some Examples of the Potential Impact of AI from the BSBA
To provide some more concrete examples, we speculate very briefly about the impact AI may have on four concentrations in the BSBA degree: Finance, Accounting, Marketing and Decision Science.

The finance industry is changing. A friend of one of the authors, with a BSc in Physics from Imperial and a PhD in Mathematics from Oxford\(^a\), was hired in 1987 by Goldman Sachs working with currency swaps. He was an early example of a trend in finance at the end of the last century in towards increasingly sophisticated predictive modeling. A new approach has been gaining ground recently; mathematical modeling is being supplanted by AI and deep learning, and has given rise to a new, rapidly growing industry segment, "fintech". Finance may increasingly rely less on people with mathematical modeling skills and more on people with

---

\(^a\) He was widely expected to become a theoretical physicist.

[Link to the McKinsey article](https://www.mckinsey.com/Business-Functions/McKinsey-Analytics/Our-Insights/Artificial-intelligence-Why-a-digital-base-is-critical?cid=other-eml-alt-mkq-mck-other-1807&dkid=91d7b62a27648f09bfece2a223b6121khetky=2972704&hdpid=8c2d0413-ec4-4e2a-89d0-8f57b1599de3; The article is not visible in the text; the URL is provided for reference.]
computer programming and decision science skills. Not only will the skills required change; since algorithms scale easily, finance will also need to employ fewer people than it has in the past. Mutual fund managers may be replaced by AI and financial advisors for the “mass-market” of the middle class will be replaced by algorithmically managed portfolios. That may mean fewer jobs for our Finance graduates.

Auditing, a major avenue for Accounting graduates, is at its core the application of a set of rules to a large amount of financial data. As far back as the 1980s, this was a task that was increasingly reliant on the use of data stored on computer. The application of rules to large quantities of data would seem to be a task for which AI is well suited. Currently, 20% of our Accounting undergraduates go into public accounting compared to 50% of AIS undergrads. If auditing becomes largely automated through the use of AI, the number of jobs for Accounting graduates will fall significantly.

Marketing messaging is now flowing in increasing volumes through social media. Platforms such as Facebook are accumulating unprecedented amounts of information on their users that can be mined using AI to tailor and target advertising and promotions. Similarly, online retail platforms like Amazon and Alibaba collect data on customers’ buying patterns and use AI algorithms to develop predictive models of the kinds of products buyers are most likely to buy. The development and placement of advertising is thus increasingly driven by tools that allow modelling of 'big data'. The Marketing curriculum may well need to shift focus to accommodate these trends.

Business Analytics is a relatively new concentration that is likely to be a beneficiary of the changes AI is bringing about. As firms move toward making ever greater use of 'big data' this concentration may well see considerable enrollment growth as the zeitgeist incorporates the realization that analyzing big data is the one of the most stable in terms of skills and growing in employment opportunities. This concentration may prove to be a significant growth opportunity for the College and the University.

Beyond the Classroom - The Structure of Post-Secondary Education
A second possible implication of the changes AI relates to the accelerating pace of change. In some cases the impact of AI may be to eliminate a job altogether, narrowing the range of employment opportunities for our graduates. It is possible, however, that AI will not simply bring about a single discontinuity in the labor market, but become a permanent driver of continuous change. Jobs may no longer remain relatively stable in terms of their activities over the span of someone’s working life. Indeed jobs may appear and disappear in a matter of years rather than decades. This increasing rate of change may affect the longevity, the “half-life”, of the knowledge and capabilities students acquire as they earn their degrees.

Currently we educate our youth almost continuously from the age of five to their early-twenties, at which point, formal education, for those not going on to graduate education, ends. Up to now, developed countries’ approaches to the challenge of automation has been to simply extend the length of time people spend in education from eleven years (leaving school at 16), to thirteen
(completing high school), to seventeen (a bachelor's degree). The next logical step in the 'knowledge economy' paradigm's progression would be to have everyone take a masters degree; but that model would likely be economically unsustainable, because of its higher the direct cost, greater opportunity cost, and the reduced length of time in which to make a return on that investment.

When AI shortens the half-life of a body of knowledge, rendering a career path obsolete in say ten years instead of thirty, the frequency and scope of 're-tooling' needed may be far greater than ever before; higher education may need to be re-configured to meet the needs of this new AI infused landscape. In some fields, what will likely be needed are shorter spells of formal education taken more frequently over one's working life. Moreover, this shorter half-life changes the cost-benefit calculation students make when considering college in the first place. Prospective students may calculate that the likely time over which they can exploit the benefits of their education is now too short to compensate for the cost of a traditional undergraduate degree and enrollment may fall. A four year degree may need to be replaced by much shorter periods of learning, perhaps eight to ten weeks every year or two.

If AI does cause an unprecedented degree of labor market disruption, governments may decide to provide a non-means-tested safety net for everyone; in the last few years, even economists have begun taking seriously the idea of a universal basic income17 and a number of experimental trials are underway18 19. This could affect higher education in two ways; it might provide more people with the time and the means to enroll in college, but it might also reduce the perceived necessity of a degree as a stepping stone to a career. It is currently unclear how these countervailing forces will affect enrollments.

The intent here is not to suggest any particular solution but simply to draw attention to the potential changes AI seems likely bring about in the job market and by extension for institutions of higher education that have provided those markets with graduates.

Career Reorientation

As noted earlier, many careers may be subject to ongoing disruption from AI, requiring frequent career pivots. To take accounting as an example, suppose that 10 years into your career with one of the "Big Four" accounting firms you find yourself looking for a new job. One possibility might be to work for a small firm or even set up in business on your own. In the latter case, this may require only a little additional learning, for example in marketing and possibly HR if you were going to hire someone. But if that isn't possible, perhaps because fewer and fewer small businesses need a the services of an accountant (think of the small tax preparation firms that have been displaced by TurboTax), then a complete career change might be the only option.

That presents a dilemma. Going back to school for another degree is costly, and the ROI, when discounted for the probability of finding a suitable job at the end, may simply not be higher

17 https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2016/06/05/universal-basic-incomes
Another way in which the University might adapt to the changing landscape is to provide lifelong career services. Currently our Career Center advises students on their choice of major and puts them in touch with employers to help them find a job after graduation. The Career Center’s role might be expanded in two ways. The easiest is that it continue to provide advice to students and connect them with potential job opportunities throughout their working lives rather than just as they leave the University. When a student finds themselves at a career discontinuity, as for example the hypothetical accountant described above, the Career Center might not only help them in looking for another accounting job, but also provide advice and guidance on a more radical “re-tooling”. In conjunction with academic advising, it could help students better understand the job landscape for a variety of alternative paths, suggest programs, masters, bachelors, or certificates, and help them figure out the costs, benefits and risks associated with each.

More fundamentally, we may need to change the way we think about who we are; currently we tend to ascribe identities, to ourselves and to others, based on a profession and often, by extension, our educational specialization (e.g. electrical engineer, computer scientist, accountant, art historian). This makes moving from one domain to another seeming more daunting than it might actually be. For example, an English major, with an understanding of the structure of language may find a transition into programming, with its syntactical rules, less traumatic than were they to try to take up accounting as a new career. Understanding people’s skills and experience at a more granular level might help career counsellors ease people, whether freshly minted graduates or alumni looking to pivot, from their current career path and onto a new trajectory. It might also require rethinking the way we pigeonhole and categorise ourselves as a society, though that is a more daunting cultural challenge.

**Next Steps**

A first step should be to better understand changes in the employment landscape AI is predicted to bring about, and the implications that has for higher education programs. Which jobs are most affected and which degrees are most closely coupled to those jobs?

We envision two approaches, one that will generate a ‘quick and dirty’ estimate of the impact of AI on degree programs, the other which will be more comprehensive but much more labor intensive and time consuming. We expect the first is something that a task force might be able to accomplish in a year or less. It would involve collecting data on jobs accepted by our graduates, and, using the McKinsey data on how jobs are likely to be affected by AI, estimate the impact on the programs that most commonly provide graduates for those jobs. This would provide a crude indication of which programs will be most impacted. To does not, however, do much more than highlight which programs are most likely to be impacted by AI.

A second approach we hope will become an integral part of the Program Planning process. In 2017, a new set of Program Planning guidelines were adopted as University policy - these place
greater emphasis on looking forward to predict where a program might need to be in five to seven years. To get a clearer understanding of AI’s impact, each program might need to analyse its curriculum much in the same way that McKinsey did in its jobs study\textsuperscript{12} to understand which courses are developing skills that are at risk from AI displacement using activities as the unit of analysis. This is much more labor intensive and may require several years to complete.

**Conclusion**

While it may seem that change is still some way off, we believe that it is time to begin considering the potential impact of AI on education. While it has been said many times in the past that a particular technological change will be radically disruptive, only to find that society and its institutions have been able to adapt, we believe that this time may be different; that the scale and speed of the changes that AI will bring about will be more than incremental adaptation in labor markets can accommodate. We suggest that proactive rather than reactive measures will be required to prevent serious disruption in the education-employment “supply chain”. Even if we are wrong, and the competence-destroying impact of AI is less than we fear, the effort to better understand AI’s likely impact will not be wasted. AI is not going away, and even if the rate of change is slower, and adaptation less traumatic than we envision, the insights gained from the work we are proposing will usefully inform that transition, even if that change takes a little longer.
The 24 elected students of the ASI Board of Directors finished their first quarter in their roles as Directors. The Board met for the final time this quarter on **Wednesday, November 28th**. Highlights from the meeting include:

- Presentation by Mary Pedersen and Bruno Giberti on the WASC Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation process
- Presentation from the Club Sports Council
- Fall Quarter Club Funding Report
- Approval of the ASI Election Timeline
- Approval of Resolution #19-02 Resolution to Support the Cal Poly 2018-2023 Strategic Plan

In addition, ASI Student Government is participating in the Center for Service in Action's Mustang Holiday Gift Drive event. Please see the following flier for more information.

Lastly, I would like to invite you all to the first Board meeting of winter quarter, which will be held on Wednesday, January 9th in UU 220 at 5:10 PM. Board meetings are held biweekly on Wednesdays and can be found listed on the ASI website at [http://www.asi.calpoly.edu](http://www.asi.calpoly.edu).
Mustang Holiday Gift Drive

GIVE BACK

Support locals in need! Select gift tags from Giving Trees at 2nd Floor of Kennedy Library, AB Student Government, Alumni House, Building 4, Room 411, and Building 52, Room E22. Each tag represents a specific request supporting local children and families in need. Bring newly purchased, unwrapped gift items to the Center for Service in Action in 52-E22.

Gifts are due by Friday, December 7th.

YOUR DONATION BENEFITS:
Big Brothers and Big Sisters of SLO
CAPCLO
Child Welfare Services of SLO County
Family Care Network, Inc.
Housing Authority of SLO
Make-A-Wish Tri-Counties
Occidental Resource Center
Pregnancy and Parenting Support of SLO County
Salvation Army
Stand Strong
Transitions Mental Health Youth Treatment Program

UNLIMITED POSSIBILITIES
RESOLUTION ON SENIOR PROJECT POLICY

Impact on Existing Policy: Updates existing policy to accommodate a variety of discipline-specific practices and encompasses the University mission. Supersedes resolutions AS-562-01, AS-594-03, AS-683-09.

Background Statement: Configuring capstone experiences that support student learning goals, align with programmatic and University objectives, and account for resources is a significant, yet complex task. The aim of this resolution is to establish an updated, comprehensive senior project policy that accommodates a variety of discipline-specific practices and encompasses the University mission.

WHEREAS, Specific guidelines for senior projects, as outlined in AS-562-01, do not adequately represent existing practices; and

WHEREAS, Guidelines and archiving requirements for senior projects are currently spread among three senate resolutions: AS-562-01, AS-594-03, and AS-683-09; and

WHEREAS, The attached policy incorporates significant elements of all three resolutions; and

WHEREAS, The current designation for senior project courses is non-standardized; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the attached policy supersedes AS-562-01, AS-594-03, and AS-683-09; and be it further, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the university adopt a standard designation for senior project courses across the curriculum, either by returning to the former practice wherein the second course digit of 6 or 7 indicates a senior project course or by requiring that every senior project course has "Senior Project" in its title.

Proposed by: Senior Project Senate Task Force
Dawn Janke, Task Force Chair
Date: September 27, 2018

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Senior Project Policy

The project method has served as the foundation of Cal Poly's curriculum since the institution's inception, and the senior project, established as an integral part of the curriculum in 1941, functions as the culmination of a student's project-based learning experiences. To this day, the university remains steadfast in its commitment to affording students an opportunity to engage in and benefit from an integrative capstone learning experience through completion of a senior project.

All Cal Poly undergraduate students shall complete a senior project as part of their baccalaureate degree program requirements.

Definition. At Cal Poly, a capstone experience is a high-impact educational practice in which students (a) integrate and evaluate the knowledge and skills gained in both the General Education (GE) and major curricula and (b) demonstrate career or postgraduate readiness.

As a bridge from college to career/postgraduate success, the senior project at Cal Poly is a capstone experience with achievable outcomes that culminates in a self-directed final production or product carried out under faculty direction. Senior projects analyze, evaluate, and synthesize a student's general and discipline-specific educational experiences; relate to a student's field of study, future employment, and/or postgraduate scholastic goals; and include an element of critical, self-reflectiveness to facilitate student development and promote the metacognitive awareness that leads to lifelong learning.

Expected Outcomes. While major programs of study shall be responsible for designing specific senior project learning outcomes, all senior projects at Cal Poly should provide an opportunity for holistic, competency-based assessment that demonstrates a strong foundation in general and discipline-specific knowledge as well as an advanced proficiency in the core competencies of critical thinking, written and oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning.

Senior projects shall broadly address program learning objectives, which should be well aligned with one or more college and university learning objective, including the ability to:

- Think critically and creatively;
- Communicate effectively;
- Demonstrate expertise in a scholarly discipline and understand that discipline in relation to the larger world of the arts, sciences, and technology;

---

1 See Helle, Tynjala, & Olkinouara (2006) for a comprehensive definition of the project method and project-based learning.
2 For the purposes of this policy, the term "shall" indicates required practices, whereas "should" represents nonmandatory, recommended practices.
4 While Cal Poly does not follow the competency-based model of education, competency-based assessment practices are effective for senior projects because such practices measure performance on a variety of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed in a specific discipline or future endeavor, such as a career or postgraduate degree. Competency-based assessment protocols invite programs to design assessment methods that ensure graduates are career- or postgraduate-ready by engaging with industry experts to design relevant outcomes. See Bral & Cunningham(2016), Klein Collins (2012, 2013), Klein-Collins, Ikanberry, & Kuh (2014), and Larsen McClarty & Gaertner (2015).
- Work productively as individuals and in groups;
- Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society;
- Make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues related to sustainability;
- Engage in lifelong learning.

**Forms & Examples.** Senior projects may be research-, project-, and/or portfolio-based; individually supervised or course-based; independently completed or team-based; discipline-specific and/or interdisciplinary. They may take forms including, but not limited to, the following:

- an experiment;
- a self-guided study;
- a student-generated research project;
- participation in a faculty-generated research project;
- engagement in an industry-driven project;
- a report based on a prior or concurrent co-op/internship or service learning experience;
- a design or construction project;
- a portfolio of work documenting the results of creative practices; and/or
- a public presentation or performance.

**Requirements**
Specific senior project requirements shall be determined at the department level; yet, all senior projects and senior project policies shall adhere to the following requirements.

Senior projects shall

- Commence when, or after, a student has earned senior standing, though completion of preparatory courses and/or research may precede senior standing;
- Serve as a bridge from the college experience to professional/postgraduate readiness;
- Include clearly defined student learning outcomes that are aligned with program learning objectives;
- Have faculty oversight with scheduled meetings for which specific timelines/outcomes are defined;
- Include a formal proposal and/or statement of intent to be submitted to the faculty advisor;
- Involve inquiry, analysis, evaluation, and creation;\(^5\)
- Demonstrate core competencies in critical thinking, written and/or oral communication, information literacy,\(^6\) and quantitative and/or qualitative reasoning in line with the University’s WASC accreditation criteria;
- Require a process/production and culminate in a final product as defined at the program level;

---

\(^5\) Because senior projects shall demonstrate mastery as appropriate for an undergraduate student, senior projects shall incorporate higher-level cognitive processes as identified in Bloom’s revised taxonomy (see Aurasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, Raths, & Witrock, 2001).

\(^6\) Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to “recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (American Library Association, 1989).
• Include an explicit element of self-reflection (e.g. dialogue with a faculty advisor, a written reflection as part of the deliverable, an oral reflection during a presentation, a self-evaluation form, etc.);
• Adhere to discipline-specific norms of academic integrity and ethical practices;
• Be individually and formally assessed;
• Include a minimum count of 3 units, or 90 hours of work,7 with no maximum;
• Take no more than three quarters to complete;
• Be assigned grades consistent with Cal Poly’s policy on grading.8

Note: Senior projects shall neither consist solely of a co-op/internship experience nor solely of a test/exam of any kind, and senior projects shall not be unsupervised.

Departments shall
• Make senior project policies and practices publicly accessible in both the catalog and on the department website;
• Instruct students, when applicable, of the need to comply with the university’s intellectual property policy; policy for the use of human subjects in research; procedures and guidelines for human subjects research; and regulations, policies, and standards for the care and use of animal subjects in research;
• Discourage costly senior projects and/or ensure students are aware that they are responsible for identifying costs and potential funding sources prior to initiation of a project;
• Set standards for group-completed senior projects, ensuring that the number of students participating in a group senior project is not so large as to unduly limit individual experience or responsibility and initiative;
• Ensure the scope of a project is robust enough for students to integrate and apply general and discipline-specific knowledge yet not overly ambitious thereby resulting in delayed time to degree;
• Review senior project processes and assess senior project artifacts at least once within a single cycle of program/accreditation review;
• Determine a process for archiving senior projects, whether at the department- or college-level and/or in collaboration with Kennedy Library.9

7 With the definition of a credit hour as 30 hours of work, as stated in Definition of a Credit Hour.
8 A grade of RP (report in progress) may be appropriate for the first quarter of a two-quarter senior project or the first and second quarters of a three-quarter project. Similarly, an I (incomplete) grade may be appropriate for a project that remains incomplete at the end of the prescribed period, although instructors are encouraged to consider the positive impact that awarding a regular letter grade may have on a student’s progress to degree completion.
9 Policies and procedures governing submissions to Kennedy Library’s institutional repository are based on University policies pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Intellectual Property Rights, and CSU accessibility requirements. Senior projects submitted to the institutional repository hosted by Kennedy Library become part of university’s scholarly record.
RECOMMENDATIONS
While departments shall establish senior project practices within the context of their specific discipline, curriculum, and pedagogy, they should incorporate multiple pathways to senior project completion and adopt any or all of the following suggestions, which draw upon best practices in capstone experiences.

Senior Projects should
- Be student-directed;
- Begin in inquiry;
- Synthesize and apply prior learning in both GE and the major;
- Involve individualized, independent learning opportunities;
- Include a written element of at least 1,000 words;
- Offer students an opportunity to create new knowledge, their learning legacy;
- Help students develop their professional and leadership skills.

Departments should
- Consider hosting informational meetings for students prior to or concurrent with senior project course enrollment;
- Scaffold the curriculum toward the senior project capstone experience by providing students with the opportunities to build their knowledge, skills, and experiences towards the level of accomplishment required by the senior project;
- Ensure all senior projects within a program challenge each student equally;
- Set the enrollment capacity for course-based senior project programs at 30 or fewer students in order to facilitate more direct interaction between a faculty member and an individual or team;
- Offer interdisciplinary senior project opportunities within a department or in partnership with other majors;
- Encourage students to engage in ethical practices and embrace principles of diversity, inclusion, and equity when completing their senior projects;
- Engage in external review of senior project artifacts by alumni, professionals, and other disciplinary experts.

For additional support, departments should consider
- Collaborating with Kennedy Library to determine an effective archiving practice for all types of scholarly outputs including traditional, non-traditional, and non-digital native born research products;
- Contacting the CTLT about workshops to help faculty develop senior project mentoring practices;
- Reviewing the set of prompts available on the APP website to learn more about ways to design effective senior project policies and practices; and/or
- Referencing some of the sources listed on the attached bibliography before developing/re-designing senior project programs.
Selected Bibliography


WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s university-level personnel policies document, the University Faculty Personnel Actions, is limited in scope and out of date; and

WHEREAS, All faculty units of Cal Poly would benefit from a more comprehensive and adaptable faculty personnel policies document; and

WHEREAS, AS-829-17 established a procedure for updating personnel policies in coherent and focused elements; and

WHEREAS, Academic Personnel maintains a centralized repository of all faculty personnel policy documents; therefore be it

RESOLVED: University-level faculty personnel policies be contained in a single document called “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP) to be housed and accessible to the campus on the Academic Personnel website; and be it further

RESOLVED: UFPP be organized according to the chapter structure in the attached report “Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document;” and be it further

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17; and be it further

RESOLVED: By the end of Spring 2019 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: October 26, 2018

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document

Faculty Affairs Committee
Fall 2018

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC is delegated the responsibility to develop faculty personnel policies and criteria through a joint governance process. The establishment of university-level academic policies through the Academic Senate is in the form of proposing and passing resolutions. When considering substantial changes to faculty policy, the FAC will request the assistance of the deans and college faculty to provide input to draft proposals prior to submission to the Senate for consideration and formal approval.

In Spring 2017 FAC proposed and the Academic Senate passed a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This new process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis. The consent agenda procedure will allow the University to quickly adopt changes that are driven by updates to state law, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, or CSU Policy changes that must be incorporated into our policies.

The guiding principles in revising the UFPA into the new UFPP include clarifying existing policies that are common across the university. Also, faculty evaluation procedures are standardized at the university level. For criteria the university-level policies set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs. Colleges and departments would consult the UFPP and cite its provisions in their policy and procedure documents. The college and department personnel policy documents should not duplicate the policies specified in the UFPP and Collective Bargaining Agreement, since the UFPP will be the definitive source for all common policies.

The process for replacing the UFPA with the UFPP will start with the establishment of the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy. Once the structure of the document has been approved by the Academic Senate and the President, FAC will propose to the Senate entire chapters of the document, each covered by its own Senate resolution. In this manner, the Senate will consider thematically unified portions of personnel policy. Once a chapter is approved by the Senate and President, FAC may propose subsequent revisions to the chapters or portions of chapters as needed. Those revisions would move through the Senate using the procedure described above, including the possibility of a consent agenda at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
General Outline of the UFPP

The Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the following general outline of a new University Faculty Personnel Policies document (UFPP):

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing that the Senate establish UFPP as the university-level faculty personnel policies document with this organization of chapters. If the Senate approves of this organization of UFPP, FAC would commence with the project of replacing the existing university-level faculty personnel policies by chapter or sub-chapter according to the Senate personnel policy procedures outlined above.

FAC is further proposing that colleges revise their policies documents to adopt the same chapter titles and numbers as UFPP. All faculty personnel policy documents would then conform to a common structure, which facilitates communication about such policies across campus. Colleges would work with Academic Personnel to conform their personnel policy documents to this common form. Once a college has revised its personnel policies document, its departments would then revise their documents into this common form.

Description of the Chapters of the UFPP

1. Preface
   The prefatory materials in the document include a general account of the hierarchy of policy in the CSU, the formal statement of the Senate personnel policy revision process, and a general statement of Cal Poly’s commitment to the teacher-scholar model. Colleges and departments can put in this section their mission/vision statements, as well as any guiding principles that inform their understanding and implementation of the teacher/scholar model, along with any policies or procedures for revising their policy documents.

2. Faculty Appointments
   This chapter provides university-wide hiring policies for all faculty appointments. Policies in this chapter refer to but do not include the more detailed hiring procedures maintained by Academic Personnel. Colleges and departments in their hiring policies
would augment these university-wide policies with their own specific criteria and
requirements for faculty appointments.

3. Personnel Files
This chapter defines the requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF)
and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). It provides a set of general requirements for
these documents that colleges and departments may augment to address the discipline
specific needs.

4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
Faculty evaluation processes have various definable functions that are common across
the university, such as the roles of candidates undergoing evaluation, Department Peer
Review Committees, Department Chair/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and
administrators such as the Deans and the Provost. This chapter defines the
responsibilities of these roles in faculty evaluation. Colleges and departments may
specify additional responsibilities of the various roles within the college or department
in faculty evaluation.

5. Evaluation Processes
Standard and familiar evaluation processes include lecturer evaluations and the
periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Each of
these processes consists of a sequence of different levels of evaluation. The levels of
evaluation were defined in Chapter 4, as the responsibilities of various evaluating
bodies, such as department and college peer committees, department chairs or heads,
or administrative evaluators. This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed
for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by all the colleges. University-level
definition of these processes allows for colleges to formulate their policy and procedure
documents using common definitions of these processes. The scope of the processes
covered in this section includes all faculty evaluation processes including instructional
faculty, library faculty, counsellors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of
evaluation levels are also covered.

6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes
leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead
to retention, promotion, and tenure for tenure-stream faculty comprise an evaluation
cycle pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-
year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all evaluation cycle patterns and
allows colleges to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and expectations.

7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
This chapter covers the eligibility for personnel actions (including retention, promotion,
tenure, range elevation) and the general principles according to which the colleges and
departments would specify the criteria for warranting the personnel action. Colleges
and departments would expand greatly on these policies with their own criteria mindful
of how the diversity of disciplines within the college manifest the teacher/scholar
model.
8. **Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services**

This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching, as well as professional services for non-instructional faculty, should be conducted by evaluating bodies. University level policies for conducting student evaluation of instruction are also included in this section. Colleges and departments would expand on these requirements and apply its principles in concrete guidance and expectations for how teaching would be evaluated. Non-instructional faculty units would do likewise for the evaluation of the relevant professional services.

9. **Evaluation of Professional Development**

This chapter includes general requirements for how evaluation of professional development should be conducted by evaluating bodies. The function of the professional development plan is the central concern of this chapter, both as constructed by the candidate and as assessed by evaluating bodies so as to guide the candidate towards the next personnel action.

10. **Evaluation of Service**

This chapter includes general requirements for how the evaluation of service should be conducted by evaluating bodies. Colleges and departments should augment the university expectations to establish expectations about service appropriate to various faculty assignments and ranks.

11. **Governance**

This chapter sets university level expectations for the definition of academic program governance at the college and department levels. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as “chairs” or “heads” and university level requirements for defining any changes between those models of department leadership. This chapter also includes university-level policies concerning departmental recommendations to deans for the appointment of department chairs. Colleges and departments would provide more specific policies and procedures in accord with university-level policies. Colleges and departments would also include in their documents any further policies about their governance, including committees within the college and department.

12. **Workload**

This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time, and policies pertaining to FERP or PRTB workload.

13. **Appendices**

This chapter is reserved for supplemental materials related to faculty personnel policies. One appendix will be the current version of the University Faculty Personnel Actions document, portions of which remain in effect until superseded by sections of the UFPP. Colleges and departments may include any number of supplementary documents as appendices, such as summary worksheets, schedules, checklists.
Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP

The need for consultation with faculty units for such a universal body of policy is obvious. In establishing Senate procedures for personnel policies FAC proposed a uniform set of expectations about such consultation requiring that any affected units be appropriately informed about the proposed change and be able to offer feedback on the proposal. FAC is then obliged by these procedures to include the nature of this feedback to the Senate with the proposal.

Over the course of several weeks in Spring and Summer 2018, Ken Brown (chair of FAC) and Al Liddicoat (Vice Provost of Academic Personnel) visited with every college council to discuss this proposed overhaul of the university personnel policies document. They explained how the old UFPA would be superseded by the new UFPP document. They laid out the new Senate procedure that would be used to create and then revise UFPP. The presentation included an earlier draft of this very report. They received feedback on the spot at those meetings from department chairs and heads, Associate Deans, and the Deans. Ken left the colleges with a feedback form (attached at the end of this report) for the college to compile feedback and send it back to FAC by the beginning of October. This timeframe for feedback allowed the college leadership to bring the topic to their departments at the beginning of Fall. They also noted that the scope of this feedback should be limited to the overall structure of UFPP, its proposed chapter breakdown, and the overall project of revising these policies, noting that the proposed text of each chapter would follow as individual items for their own comparable and suitable level of consultative feedback. (The nature of the proposed changes to university policy affects the non-instructional units far less than to the colleges, and FAC has been made aware of recent changes to policy documents from, for instance, the Library.)

From this useful feedback, FAC has made some notable changes to the proposed structure of the document. College councils will again be informed of this proposal when it is put on the Senate agenda so further feedback can be directed through their Senators.

Changes to Existing Policy

This proposed change includes no policy, but instead establishes the structure of a policy document. The changes to the policy language will come when FAC proposes chapters that fill out this policy document.

Implementation

At this stage of establishing the structure of UFPP there is no implementation of policy, since this proposal includes no policy, but only the chapter structure of the subsequent policy document. Implementation in this case amounts to the project of the colleges, and in turn of departments, to conform the structure of their personnel policy documents to the uniform structure of policy documents set by the UFPP. This implementation should conform with the timeframe set in the resolution to which this report is attached.
Feedback for Faculty Affairs Committee

College:

Main contact for further information about this feedback:
   Name:
   Position:
   Email:

The FAC is considering having colleges and departments structure their personnel policy documents with the same chapter divisions of the proposed UFPPP.¹ Note that a department policy and procedure document could defer to its college’s policies and procedures on any topic. Please indicate whether and how this change in the organization of faculty personnel policy and procedure documents would affect your college and departments.

Please identify and describe any other topics addressed in your college or department level personnel policies and procedures documents that seem not to fit into any of the proposed chapters for the new UFPPP listed and described above.

Please offer any questions or feedback about the proposed organizational structure of the new UFPPP.

When the Faculty Affairs Committee solicits feedback from colleges about drafts of the chapters of the proposed UFPPP, information about the proposed new policies would be sent to the Dean to be distributed to Associate Deans, Analysts in the Dean’s office, Department Chairs/Heads, and any faculty committee tasked with considering matters of personnel policy in the college. Are there other methods that should be used to solicit feedback from your college?

The project of replacing the old UFPA with the new UFPPP is more about the clarification of existing policy and involves little change to existing policy. Any revision to a policy document raises reasonable questions about the status of those policies. Please offer any general feedback or concerns in your college or departments about university level personnel policies and their relationship to your college and department level policies.

Please email this document with any feedback from your college to the Faculty Affairs Committee chair, Ken Brown (dbrown07@calpoly.edu) by October 1, 2018.

¹ When this feedback document was circulated to the colleges, the FAC was proposing a document called University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures. Based on feedback from the colleges, FAC dropped the reference in the title to procedures.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-—-18

RESOLUTION ON CAMPUS CLIMATE
UNIVERSITY OMBUDS AND TRAINING

WHEREAS, According to data on the CSU Student Success Dashboards and a recent article in the San Luis Obispo Tribune, Cal Poly has the least racial/ethnic diversity in the CSU System; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has required periodic anti-harassment, discrimination, retaliation training for all Cal Poly employees with direct supervisory responsibility over students; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly faculty come in contact with students in other ways including classrooms as well as during advising; and

WHEREAS, Ombuds services provide early intervention that can resolve conflicts before they develop into more serious concerns; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has an Office of Student Ombuds Services that provides students with assistance in resolving university related issues, concerns, conflicts or complaints; and

WHEREAS, 14 of the CSU campuses have Ombuds Offices as of October 2018; and

WHEREAS, A majority (10 of 14) of these CSU Ombuds Offices serve students, faculty and staff, and 5 of the 14 also serve MPP; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that the responsibilities of the Ombuds Office be expanded to include all University constituents; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that this expansion of the responsibilities of the Ombuds Office be done in such a way that the services provided for students not be adversely affected; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that all Cal Poly employees undergo periodic sexual harassment anti-harassment, discrimination, retaliation training; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that all Cal Poly employees undergo periodic implicit bias training; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that Cal Poly establish rewards to encourage employees to participate in Employment Equity Facilitator training; and be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate reaffirms its commitment to Academic Senate Resolution, AS-695-09, Resolution on the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to community.

 Proposed by: Paul Choboter - Math Department, Dianne DeTurris - Aerospace Engineering Department, Ashley Eberle - Career Services, Harvey Greenwald - Emeritus Academic Senate Chair, Camille O'Bryant - Associate Dean, CSM

Date: September 13, 2018
Revised: November 13, 2018
IOA STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

PREAMBLE

The IOA Standards of Practice are based upon and derived from the ethical principles stated in the IOA Code of Ethics.

Each Ombudsman office should have an organizational Charter or Terms of Reference, approved by senior management, articulating the principles of the Ombudsman function in that organization and their consistency with the IOA Standards of Practice.

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

INDEPENDENCE

1.1 The Ombudsman Office and the Ombudsman are independent from other organizational entities.
1.2 The Ombudsman holds no other position within the organization which might compromise independence.
1.3 The Ombudsman exercises sole discretion over whether or how to act regarding an individual’s concern, a trend or concerns of multiple individuals over time. The Ombudsman may also initiate action on a concern identified through the Ombudsman’s direct observation.
1.4 The Ombudsman has access to all information and all individuals in the organization, as permitted by law.
1.5 The Ombudsman has authority to select Ombudsman Office staff and manage Ombudsman Office budget and operations.

NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY

2.1 The Ombudsman is neutral, impartial, and unaligned.
2.2 The Ombudsman seeks for impartiality, fairness and objectivity in the treatment of people and the consideration of issues. The Ombudsman advocates for fair and equitably administered processes and does not act on behalf of any individual within the organization.
2.3 The Ombudsman is a designated neutral reporting to the highest possible level of the organization and operating independent of ordinary line and staff structures. The Ombudsman should not report to nor be structurally affiliated with any compliance function of the organization.
2.4 The Ombudsman serves in no additional role within the organization which would compromise the Ombudsman’s neutrality. The Ombudsman should not be aligned with any formal or informal associations within the organization in a way that might create actual or perceived conflicts of interest for the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman should have no personal interest or stake in, and incur no gain or loss from, the outcome of an issue.
2.5 The Ombudsman has a responsibility to consider the legitimate concerns and interests of all individuals affected by the matter under consideration.
2.6 The Ombudsman helps develop a range of reasonable options to resolve problems and facilitate discussion to identify the best options.

CONFIDENTIALITY

3.1 The Ombudsman holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence and takes all reasonable steps to safeguard confidentiality, including the following:

3.1.1 The Ombudsman does not reveal, and must not be required to reveal, the identity of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, nor does the Ombudsman reveal information provided in confidence that could lead to the identification of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, without that individual’s express permission, given in the course of informal discussions with the Ombudsman; the Ombudsman takes specific action related to an individual's issue only with the individual’s express permission and only to the extent permitted, and even then at the sole discretion of the Ombudsman, unless such action can be taken in a way that safeguards the identity of the individual contacting the Ombudsman Office. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm, and where there is no other reasonable option. Whether this risk exists is a determination to be made by the Ombudsman.
3.1.2 Communications between the Ombudsman and others (made while the Ombudsman is serving in that capacity) are considered privileged. The privilege belongs to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman Office, rather than to any party to an issue. Others cannot waive this privilege.
3.1.3 The Ombudsman does not testify in any formal process outside the organization and resists testifying in any formal process outside of the organization regarding a visitor’s contact with the Ombudsman or confidential information communicated to the Ombudsman, even if given permission or requested to do so. The Ombudsman may, however, provide general, non-identifying information about the Ombudsman Office or the Ombudsman profession.
3.1.4 If the Ombudsman pursues an issue systematically (e.g., provides feedback on trends, issues, policies and practices) the Ombudsman does so in a way that safeguards the identity of individuals.
3.1.5 The Ombudsman keeps no records containing identifying information on behalf of the organization.
3.1.6 The Ombudsman maintains information (e.g., notes, phone messages, appointment calendars) in a secure location and manner, protected from inspection by others (including management), and has a consistent and standard practice for the destruction of such information.
3.1.7 The Ombudsman prepares any data and/or reports in a manner that preserves confidentiality.
3.1.8 Communications made to the Ombudsman are not restricted to the organization. The Ombudsman neither acts as agent for, nor accepts notice on behalf of, the organization and shall not serve in a position or role that is designated by the organization as a place to receive notice on behalf of the organization. However, the Ombudsman may refer individuals to the appropriate place where formal notice can be made.

INFORMALITY AND OTHER STANDARDS

4.1 The Ombudsman functions on an informal basis by such means as: listening, providing and receiving information, identifying and reframing issues, developing a range of reasonable options, and— with permission and at Ombudsman discretion — engaging in informal third-party intervention. When possible, the Ombudsman helps people develop new ways to solve problems themselves.
4.2 The Ombudsman as an informal and off-the-record resource pursues resolution of concerns and looks into procedural irregularities and/or broader systemic problems when appropriate.
4.3 The Ombudsman does not make binding decisions, mandate policies, or formally adjudicate issues for the organization.
4.4 The Ombudsman supplements, but does not replace, any formal channels. Use of the Ombudsman Office is voluntary, and is not a required step in any grievance process or organizational policy.
4.5 The Ombudsman does not participate in any formal investigative or adjudicative procedures. Formal investigations should be conducted by others. When a formal investigation is initiated, the Ombudsman should recuse himself/herself.
4.6 The Ombudsman identifies trends, issues and concerns about policies and procedures, including potential future issues and concerns, without breaching confidentiality or anonymity, and provides recommendations for responsibly addressing them.
4.7 The Ombudsman acts in accordance with the IOA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, keeps professionally current by pursuing continuing education, and provides opportunities for staff to pursue professional training.
4.8 The Ombudsman endeavors to be worthy of the trust placed in the Ombudsman Office.

www.ombudsassociation.org
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-807-15

RESOLUTION ON CAL POLY STATEMENT ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVITY

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has approved several resolutions since 1987 regarding the importance of diversity and educational equity; and

WHEREAS, Among these resolutions includes the "Cal Poly Statement on Diversity," which was approved in 1998 (AS-506-98/DTF); and

WHEREAS, In the ensuing years since the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity was approved, faculty, staff, and students have worked to gain a deeper understanding of the importance of diversity and educational equity through a myriad of approaches, including the adoption of the Inclusive Excellence Model in 2009 (AS-682-09); and

WHEREAS, Today at Cal Poly we continue to strive to increase diversity, but in addition, we attend more closely than ever to fostering a culture of inclusivity for every faculty, staff, and student member on this campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Inclusive Excellence Council has developed a new statement on diversity to reflect the inclusivity aspect of our university; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the attached Cal Poly Statement on Diversity and Inclusivity.

Proposed by: Inclusive Excellence Council
Date: September 29, 2015
Cal Poly Statement on Diversity and Inclusivity*

September 29, 2015
Revised - November 12, 2015
Approved - November 17, 2015

At Cal Poly we believe that academic freedom, a cornerstone value, is exercised best when there is understanding and respect for our diversity of experiences, identities, and worldviews. Consequently, we create learning environments that allow for meaningful development of self-awareness, knowledge, and skills alongside attention to others who may have experiences, worldviews, and values that are different from our own. In so doing, we encourage our students, faculty, and staff to seek out opportunities to engage with others who are both similar and different from them, thereby increasing their capacity for knowledge, empathy, and conscious participation in local and global communities.

In the spirit of educational equity, and in acknowledgement of the significant ways in which a university education can transform the lives of individuals and communities, we strive to increase the diversity at Cal Poly. As an institution that serves the state of California within a global context, we support the recruitment, retention, and success of talented students, faculty, and staff from across all societies, including people who are from historically and societally marginalized and underrepresented groups.

Cal Poly is an inclusive community that embraces differences in people and thoughts. By being open to new ideas and showing respect for diverse points of view, we support a climate that allows all students, faculty, and staff to feel valued, which in turn facilitates the recruitment and retention of a diverse campus population. We are a culturally invested university whose members take personal responsibility for fostering excellence in our own and others' endeavors. To this end, we support an increased awareness and understanding of how one's own identity facets (such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, disability, social class, and nation of origin) and the combinations of these identities and experiences that may accompany them can affect our different worldviews.

*The definition of diversity is specifically inclusive of, but not limited to, and individual's race/ethnicity, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, cultural heritage, disability, and sexual orientation.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at Cal Poly accept and endorse The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity attached; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate in partnership with its administration devise plans and strategies to promulgate and implement the diversity and educational objectives outlined in The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to its administration that the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs provide an annual assessment of the previously mentioned partnership's diversity related activities to the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: The Diversity Task Force
Date: April 21, 1998
Revised: June 8, 1998
THE CAL POLY STATEMENT ON DIVERSITY*

At the heart of a university is the responsibility for providing its students with a well-rounded education, an education that fosters their intellectual, personal and social growth. For students preparing to embark upon work and life in the 21st century, a critical element of a well-rounded education is the ability to understand and to function effectively in a diverse and increasingly interdependent global society. As noted in a recent statement from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), "the argument for the necessity of diversity is perhaps stronger in higher education than in any other context... The ultimate product of universities is education in the broadest sense, including preparation for life in the working world." In this regard, it is in the compelling interest of Cal Poly, the state, and the nation to provide our students with an education that is rich with a diversity of ideas, perspectives, and experiences.

Thus, diversity serves as a fundamental means to enhance both the quality and value of education. It cannot be a mere adjunct to such an education but must be an integral element of the educational experience, infused throughout the community (faculty, students, and staff), the curriculum, and the co-curricular programs of the University.

As a University whose motto is "to learn by doing," Cal Poly explicitly understands the importance that experience brings to education. When students are exposed personally and directly to faculty, staff, and other students from diverse backgrounds, their stereotypes about "the other" are challenged. As the AAUP statement notes, such personal interaction gives students an understanding of the "range of similarities and differences within and among ... groups" that "no textbook or computer" can provide. For this reason, both the formal and informal classroom (i.e., the rich learning experiences that occur for our students during their co-curricular activities), must be constituted in a way that reinforces the value of encountering and considering diversity.

Moreover, diversity in the curriculum is a fundamental component of a well-rounded and beneficial education. The perspectives provided by the University are contingent upon the content and purpose of its courses. Since the curriculum is the principal expression of our educational goals and values, it must signal the importance of diversity to the Cal Poly mission, to the institutional culture, and to our teaching and learning environment in clear and unambiguous terms.

Thus, the University community (its students, faculty, and staff), the curriculum, and the co-curricular environment must be dedicated to the principle of ensuring that all of our students routinely encounter diverse people, ideas, and experiences.

Only through intellectual and first-hand personal exposure to diversity in its myriad forms-racial, ethnic, cultural, gender, geographic, socioeconomic, etc.-will students gain the understanding, empathy, and social skills that they will require to be effective, engaged citizens in an increasingly crowded and interrelated global community. The benefit of diversity is universal. Cal Poly's commitment to diversity signals an affirmation of the highest educational goals of this University, including mutual respect, civility, and engaged learning.

*The definition of diversity is specifically inclusive of, but not limited to, an individual's race/ethnicity, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, cultural heritage, disability, and sexual orientation.
State of California
Memorandum

To: Myron Hood
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Date: September 18, 1998

Copies: Paul J. Zingg
Harvey Greenwald
Linda Dalton

Subject: AS-505-98/DTF, Resolution on the Academic Value of Diversity
AS-506-98/DTF, Resolution on The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity

I am pleased to accept Resolutions AS-505-98/DTF and AS-506-98/DTF.

The Academic Senate is to be applauded for its clear affirmation of the educational values of diversity and its recognition that diversity strengthens our community and prepares our students more fully for effective citizenship, responsible careers and engaged lives.

Both resolutions underscore the University's values that are imbedded in our Mission Statement and Strategic Plan. The voice of the Senate in these matters will strengthen the University's ability to continue its efforts to foster greater diversity among our students, faculty and staff. Clearly aligning Cal Poly with the important statements on diversity that the nation's principal educational associations have made signals our commitment and resolve.

I look forward to working with the Senate and our entire University community in achieving the promise within these resolutions.
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has a 30-plus year history of espousing the principles of Making Excellence Inclusive as a learning-community imperative – most recently in the Senate’s Fall ’08 retreat and (AS-663-08) Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives; and

WHEREAS, “Build an Inclusive Community” is one of seven goals of the Cal Poly Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, A learning environment that supports attention to diversity is a standard of accreditation as promulgated by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has affirmed the academic value of diversity (AS-505-98); therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support Making Excellence Inclusive as a goal and organizing principle of the Cal Poly learning community; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That resources for the professional development of faculty in Making Excellence Inclusive be established, sustained, and identified by the University, colleges, and other instructionally-related entities as part of their inventory of efforts to promote Inclusive Excellence; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That faculty efforts in Making Excellence Inclusive be recognized as a substantive component of voluntary service in the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) evaluation process.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 30 2009
Revised: April 28 2009
Revised: May 20 2009
Revised: May 26 2009
State of California  
Memorandum  

To: John Soares  
Chair, Academic Senate  

From: Warren J. Bakey  
President  

Date: June 22, 2009  

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-682-09  
Resolution on Making Excellence Inclusive at Cal Poly  

This is to formally acknowledge receipt and approval of the above-referenced Academic Senate resolution.  

Please express my appreciation to the Academic Senate members for their work on this issue.
MEMORANDUM
Cal Poly | Office of the President

To: Gary Laver
Date: March 28, 2016

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President

Copies: K. Enz Finken
J. DeCosta

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-807-15
Resolution on Cal Poly Statement on Diversity and Inclusivity

I am pleased to accept and support the above-entitled Academic Senate Resolution.

The Academic Senate has a long history of supporting diversity and inclusivity initiatives going back into the 1980’s. I applaud this history. I appreciate deeply that the Academic Senate has shown repeatedly that it understands why it is critical to the success of our faculty, staff and students that we continue to evolve in our approach to not only recruiting diverse faculty, staff and students, but also in improving our campus climate so that everyone can work and learn in an environment that is welcoming.

Please express my appreciation to the Inclusive Excellence Council for their attention to this important matter.
RESOLUTION ON
THE CAL POLY STATEMENT ON COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY

BACKGROUND: The Committee on University Citizenship (CUCIT) is a University-wide standing committee charged with exploring issues and making policy recommendations related to the preservation and ongoing development of a vital, effective tradition of University citizenship at Cal Poly. The committee explores and makes recommendations on strategies designed to foster and expand:

- an engaged, civil, and mutually respectful classroom and other educational environments;
- a tradition of confident, effective, and civil public campus discourse that prepares students for active civic engagement and leadership roles;
- a greater awareness of factors that lead to hostile campus work environments and strategies for further promoting campus work environments that are free from harassment and characterized by mutual respect and support; and
- the civic engagement of students, faculty, and staff beyond the University — and for strengthening Cal Poly’s role as a good institutional citizen in regional, state, national, and international contexts.

(Distilled from http://www.president.calpoly.edu/committees/CUCIT.pdf)

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and endorse the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community; and, be it further

2 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate work with its University’s administration in developing plans and strategies to help realize the values of the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: April 21 2009
Revised: April 28 2009
Revised: October 06 2009
Revised: October 13 2009
Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community

The Cal Poly community values a broad and inclusive campus learning experience where its members embrace core values of mutual respect, academic excellence, open inquiry, free expression and respect for diversity. Membership in the Cal Poly community is consistent with the highest principles of shared governance, social and environmental responsibility, engagement and integrity.

As students, faculty and staff of Cal Poly, we choose to:

- Act with integrity and show respect for ourselves and one another
- Accept responsibility for our individual actions
- Support and promote collaboration in University life
- Practice academic honesty in the spirit of inquiry and discovery
- Contribute to the university community through service and volunteerism
- Demonstrate concern for the well-being of others
- Promote the benefits of diversity by practicing and advocating openness, respect and fairness

Individual commitment to these actions is essential to Cal Poly's dedication to an enriched learning experience for all its members.

Committee on University Citizenship
October 13 2009
State of California
Memorandum

To: Rachel Femflores
   Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-695-09
         Resolution on the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community

Date: February 16, 2010

Copies: R. Koob, D. Conn,
        E. Smith, C. Morton

I formally acknowledge receipt and approval of the above-referenced Academic Senate Resolution.

Please express my appreciation to the Committee on University Citizenship for their work on this issue. As endorsed by the Academic Senate, the "Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community" provides a common sense set of principles for effective community participation and engagement, consistent with Cal Poly's core educational mission and values. I commend it to all Cal Poly students, faculty, and staff.
Black Students at Public Colleges and Universities
A 50-STATE REPORT CARD

By Shaun R. Harper and Isaiah Simmons
USC Race and Equity Center
More than 900,000 Black undergraduates are enrolled at public colleges and universities across the United States. This report is about the status of those students at every four-year, non-specialized, public postsecondary institution in the nation.

We combine U.S. Census population statistics with quantitative data from the U.S. Department of Education to measure postsecondary access and student success for Black undergraduates. Letter grades (A, B, C, D, F, and I) are awarded to each institution.

Private schools, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges, military academies, university health and medical institutes, graduate universities, community colleges, and public institutions that primarily confer associate degrees are not included in our analyses.

This report is arranged by state. Statistics and grades for 506 individual public institutions are provided on each state’s list.

EQUITY INDICATORS

Here are the four equity indicators on which we graded public colleges and universities.

○ Representation Equity

Extent to which Black students’ share of enrollment in the undergraduate student population reflects their representation among 18-24 year-olds in that state.

○ Completion Equity

Extent to which the proportionality of Black women’s and Black men’s respective shares of Black student enrollments in the undergraduate student population reflects the national gender enrollment distribution across all racial/ethnic groups (55.3% women, 43.7% men).

○ Gender Equity

Extent to which the proportionality of Black women’s and Black men’s respective shares of Black student enrollments in the undergraduate student population are the same as the overall six-year graduation rates during those same time periods at each institution.

○ Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio

Ratio of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates to full-time Black instructional faculty members on each campus.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Black citizens are 14.6% of 18-24 year-olds across the 50 states, yet only 9.8% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates at public colleges and universities are Black. At more than three-fourths of public institutions, traditional-aged Black students are under-enrolled relative to their residency in the states.

- Across all racial/ethnic groups, women comprise 56.3% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates at public postsecondary institutions. The enrollment gap between Black women and men is less pronounced. Just over 52% of Black undergraduates at public colleges and universities are women.
Across four cohorts, 39.4% of Black students completed bachelor's degrees at public institutions within six years, compared to 70.8% of undergraduates overall. Forty-one percent of public colleges and universities graduate one-third or fewer Black students within six years.

For every full-time Black faculty member at a public college or university, there are 4.2 full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates. Forty-third or fewer Black students within six years.

Overall, 39.4% of Black students completed bachelor's degrees at public institutions within six years, compared to 70.8% of undergraduates overall. Forty-one percent of public colleges and universities graduate one-third or fewer Black students within six years.

When outlining goals and charting progress, it is necessary to be specific. As such, I am thankful to the USC Race and Equity Center for being specific in identifying Black undergraduates in this report. Too often “students of color” are lumped together as if their “otherness” makes them all the same. If we are to be serious about our endeavors, we must be careful to examine challenges as specifically as possible in order to be clear about the kinds of remedies that are needed. The valuable, carefully curated information furnished in this 50-state report card allows educators and leaders to take seriously our task of critical self-reflection and assessment. Only by focusing our attention in specific ways and acknowledging our specific challenges can we begin to specifically address them. I look forward to this work in the Garden State, and hope that other higher education leaders across the country will take seriously this task as well.

MESSAGE FROM DR. ZAKIYA SMITH ELLIS
SECRETARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
State of New Jersey

Prior to joining the New Jersey Goverment's cabinet in 2020, Dr. Smith Ellis was Strategy Director for Lumina Foundation. She has also served as Senior Policy Advisor for Education at the White House and a senior policy advisor at the U.S. Department of Education.

To ensure the best possible educational experiences and outcomes for our students, critical self-examination has to be a common practice among postsecondary education leaders. Many of us within institutions and state higher education systems routinely assess our programs toward goals, examine ourselves to peers, and develop strategic plans to address our findings. New Jersey is currently in the midst of a long-overdue exploration of this very sort.

Self-assessments must include an honest look at where we stand in addressing equity for students of color. While this should be a component of our planning at all times, it takes on even more significance within our current anti-racist climate. We are facing a critical juncture in determining the type of nation we want to be—public colleges and universities have an especially urgent and influential role to play in shaping that path. To say this is important work would be an understatement.

Leaving in college is not confined to classrooms. Instead, it is woven throughout the educational experience. Higher education leaders often spend a great deal of time thinking about expanding college opportunity and improving learning within and beyond classrooms. We should also carefully consider how the experiences we provide students of color align with stated goals for their success. Colleges and universities convey messages about who is valued in society through signals such as the nature of the faculty, the composition of the student body, and the role people of color play in top leadership positions.

These signals are sent at a time when students are developing their sense of self and determining how they will interact with others in society. So, meaningful equity work is imperative to ensuring a better future, not just for our students, but also for our institutions.

We hope this publication will be useful to Black students and their families, postsecondary leaders and faculty members, policymakers, journalists, and a wide range of stakeholders who care about Black students' educational experiences and attainment rates. As such, we present data on equity by institutions within this report. Our aim is to make inequities more transparent and to equip anyone concerned about enrollment, success, and college completion rates for Black students with members they can use to demand concrete policies and institutional actions.

This report should not be misused to reinforce deficit narratives about Black undergraduates. Problematic trends presented herein are not fully explained by the factor of K-12 schools in effectively preparing these students for college admission and success or to bad parenting, student disengagement, and low motivation. They also are attributable to institutional practices, policies, mindsets, and cultures that persistently disadvantage Black students and sustain inequities.

Ideally, leaders on college campuses and in state systems of higher education will take seriously the statistics we furnish in this document. We want them to respond by swiftly engaging in rigorous, strategic, and collaborative work to improve the status of Black undergraduates at their institutions. Data presented in this publication ought to inform their efforts and help ensure accountability.

USING THIS REPORT

We hope this publication will be useful to Black students and their families, postsecondary leaders and faculty members, policymakers, journalists, and a wide range of stakeholders who care about Black students' educational experiences and attainment rates. As such, we present data on equity by institutions within this report. Our aim is to make inequities more transparent and to equip anyone concerned about enrollment, success, and college completion rates for Black students with members they can use to demand concrete policies and institutional actions.

This report should not be misused to reinforce deficit narratives about Black undergraduates. Problematic trends presented herein are not fully explained by the factor of K-12 schools in effectively preparing these students for college admission and success or to bad parenting, student disengagement, and low motivation. They also are attributable to institutional practices, policies, mindsets, and cultures that persistently disadvantage Black students and sustain inequities.

Ideally, leaders on college campuses and in state systems of higher education will take seriously the statistics we furnish in this document. We want them to respond by swiftly engaging in rigorous, strategic, and collaborative work to improve the status of Black undergraduates at their institutions. Data presented in this publication ought to inform their efforts and help ensure accountability.
Starting with the Morrill Act of 1862, public universities were built to expand access and success for state residents underserved by private institutions. Low-income students came to land-grant universities to explore the world of higher education. This was intended to create a pipeline for low-income students to enter the workforce and improve their economic status. However, the reality is that many of these students are not able to access higher education opportunities due to systemic barriers such as lack of funding, inadequate support systems, and institutional racism.

In 2018, Black students are now members of higher education's New Majority: first generation, students of color, adult learners, and women. Every public university is responsible for educating this majority. The good news is that the public sector has expanded since 1862. Land-grant universities have been joined by numerous regional publics, like my university, Governors State University. Progressive postsecondary institutions must also contribute to equity goals. Working together, we have the capacity to provide excellent educational opportunities to what used to be considered minority populations. High quality education for the New Majority, as well as for the new minority (traditional students), must be the mission of state universities.

Higher education in the United States is a public good. While it confers numerous personal and material advantages to individuals, it serves significantly to expand opportunities and enhance innovation. Americans who graduate from college are considerably less likely than those without degrees to be unemployed, dependent on government assistance, and confined to low-wage jobs with inadequate employer benefits and limited opportunities for upward professional advancement. Institutions of higher education help make this possible. While all colleges and universities contribute, those that are public play an especially significant role. Public institutions were originally built to educate the public. Taxpayers in each of the 50 states help support them. Campuses, therefore, belong to the public. A portion of the public is Black. As data in this report make painfully clear, too many public colleges and universities fail to offer Black students equitable access to one of our nation’s most valuable public goods.

Inequities in higher education are inextricably linked to larger social forces. For example, citizens who live in your neighborhoods with high unemployment and excessive crime also typically lack access to quality healthcare, nutritious foods, fair policing, and K-12 schools that are high performing and equitably measured. Unfortunately, a disproportionate number of Americans disadvantaged by these forces are Black. Some might argue such challenges are beyond the control of public postsecondary institutions. Actually, higher education helps rectify (and to some extent, exacerbate) these inequities. The pervasive majority of our nation’s elected officials are college graduates—so, too, are CEOs, physicians and nurses, judges and lawyers, school teachers and administrators, and leaders in most sectors of our economy. As colleges and universities restrict the number of talented professionals to fill their ranks, the result is a surge in the number of students who cannot afford to attend college.

Inequities in higher education are not fully explained by forces external to a college campus. There are numerous factors and conditions within it that determine who gets admitted, how they are treated once they matriculate, the inclusiveness of their learning environments, the cultural relevance of what they are taught, the racial diversity of their professors, and their likelihood for personal wellness and academic success. As our data show, faculty members and leaders on too many campuses are bad teachers of the public good, at least as it pertains to Black students. Instead of asking, “why are Black undergraduates doing so poorly at public institutions,” we encourage readers to question, why public colleges and universities do so poorly at enrolling and graduating Black students; ensuring gender equity among them; and affording them greater, more reasonable access to same-sex faculty members.

Clearly, policymakers are concerned that public postsecondary institutions contribute to the public, including Black residents within states they represent. Moreover, most college presidents, trustees, senior administrators, professors, and admissions officers are White. Too, they are responsible for better serving Black students and affirming their greater access to the public good that is public higher education.
Examined in this report are four access and equity indicators for Black undergraduates at every four-year, non-specialized, public postsecondary institution in the United States. We analyzed quantitative data from two open-access federal data sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey and the U.S. Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

We did not award letter grades to Texas Woman's University and Mississippi University for Women on the Gender Equity indicator. Though both are now co-educational, their single-sex origins explain why Black women's enrollments are drastically unequal across Black males.

IPEDS graduation rates data were missing for 11 colleges and universities. We awarded incompletes (I's) to those schools on the Completion Equity indicator and did not factor it into their Equity Index Score. These institutions likely have a variety of reasonable explanations for non-reporting. For instance, Cameron State University did not admit its first freshman class until 2014, and therefore does not yet have a six-year graduation rate. Calculating CSU’s rates across four cohorts of six-year graduates will not be possible until 2023. The 10 other non-reporting institutions probably have similarly unique circumstances.

UNLIKE MOST REPORT CARDs, HIGH GRADES (A's AND B's) IN THIS PUBLICATION ARE NOT NECESSARILY INDICATORS OF EXCEPTIONAL PERFORMANCE. INSTEAD, THEY ARE MARKERS OF REPRESENTATION BETWEEN BLACK UNDERGRADUATES AND COMPARISON GROUPS. WE PRESENT TWO ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES IN THIS SECTION.

First, at New Mexico State University, the six-year graduation rate across four cohorts of Black undergraduates was 18.6%, compared to 20.1% for all undergraduates. On average, across all public institutions, 11.2 percentage points separate Black undergraduates and students overall on our Completion Equity indicator. Hence, New Mexico State’s relatively low 1.5 percentage point gap places it among the top 20% of public institutions. That four of every five undergraduates who enter at New Mexico State do not attain degrees from them within six years renders it a low-performing institution, despite its grade on this particular indicator.

Second, as A was awarded to Michigan Technological University because its 12:1 Black student-to-Black faculty ratio is one of the lowest among public institutions in the nation, thereby placing it in the top quintile. However, it is worth noting that Michigan Tech had only 48 full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates and a total of four full-time Black instructional faculty members across all fields in the 2016-17 academic year. Black representation at Michigan Tech is alarmingly low, especially given its size and the relatively high number of Black residents across the state to which it is located.

In light of these two examples, we strongly encourage readers to look at all data we provide for each institution, not just its letter grades and Equity Index Score.

LIMITATIONS

Each equity indicator in this report has at least one noteworthy limitation. Representation Equity includes only 18-24-year-old Black citizens in each state, those who are the same age as traditional college enrollees. Some Black undergraduates attending four-year institutions are attending adult learners. Black student enrollment percentages also include them, but the state residency percentages do not. It is important to acknowledge that at many public four-year institutions (especially research universities) the overwhelming majority of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates are traditional age.

Our Gender Equity measure treats gender as a binary (women and men), which is a limitation. We analyzed and report the data this way because IPEDS has no other gender identity options.

Federal graduation rates do not account for undergraduates who transferred from one institution to another, which is a limitation of our Completion Equity measure. Transfer students are counted as dropouts in IPEDS. No published evidence or anecdotal reports suggest that Black undergraduates are any more or less likely than are transfers of other racial groups to transfer from public colleges and universities to other postsecondary institutions.

Lastly, as previously noted in our Michigan Tech example, we awarded A's to some institutions that employ a pathetically low number of full-time Black instructional faculty members and enroll very few full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates. This is a limitation of our Black Students-to-Black Faculty Ratio measure. It extends across the other three indicators as well. Distributing grades by quintiles demanded that we inevitably award A's and B's to some institutions that perform poorly, but relatively not as bad as three-fifths of other public colleges and universities.

DATA ACCURACY

Institutional data we present in this report are from the U.S. Department of Education’s publicly available Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Every college and university in the nation receiving federal funds is required to annually submit these and other data to IPEDS. Statistical inaccuracies in this report are most likely attributable to erroneous institutional reporting to the federal government or to technical processing errors in IPEDS. Questions or concerns about data accuracy should be directed to the IPEDS Data Use Help Desk at 1-866-559-0658.
Institutions with highest and lowest equity index scores

**Highest Scores**

- Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
- University of California-San Diego
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- University of California-Irvine
- University of California-Berkeley

**Lowest Scores**

- Florida Polytechnic University
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of South Carolina
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Michigan

Highlighted on this page are public colleges and universities with exceptionally high and low equity index scores. On the one hand, we think it is important to call attention to institutions that outperform others on the four equity measures chosen for this study. But on the other hand, we deem it problematic to offer kudos to any campus that sustains inequity on any equity indicator or that otherwise disadvantages Black undergraduates. Put differently, a campus that performs well in comparison to others is not necessarily a national model of excellence that is exempt from recommendations offered at the end of this report.
# 50 State Data Tables

**WITH STATISTICS, GRADES, AND EQUITY INDEX SCORES FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS**

### ALABAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Equity</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville State University</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy University</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama - Birmingham</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama - Huntsville</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Alabama</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Alabama</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Alabama</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALASKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Equity</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Anchorage</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Fairbanks</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Juneau</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Statewide Equity (Index Score)</td>
<td>Gender Equity</td>
<td>Competitive Equity</td>
<td>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University-Gilbert</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALIFORNIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Statewide Equity (Index Score)</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Competitive Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State University - San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University - San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University - San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University - San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University - Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Colorado Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Statewide Equity Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connecticut Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Statewide Equity Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delaware Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Statewide Equity Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Florida Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Statewide Equity Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Georgia Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Statewide Equity Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Idaho

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho at Boise</td>
<td>3.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho at Moscow</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho at Idaho</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Hawaii

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Manoa</td>
<td>2.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Hilo</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Honolulu</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Illinois

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>2.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Springfield</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indiana

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University at Bloomington</td>
<td>2.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University at South Bend</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Iowa

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>2.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Kansas

**Statewide Equity Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representation Equity</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>2.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas at Kansas</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas at Wichita</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sunnise Equity</td>
<td>Sunnise Equity</td>
<td>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSISSIPPI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MISSOURI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MONTANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statewide Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Index Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Equity Score</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## North Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Equity Score</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## North Dakota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Equity Score</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ohio Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oklahoma Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oregon Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Representation Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern State University</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State University</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern State University</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State University</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMPOSITION EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern State University</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State University</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern State University</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State University</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Equity Score</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
<th>Black Student to Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td>Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td>Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td>Statewide Equity Index Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TENNESSEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION EQUITY</th>
<th>GENDER EQUITY</th>
<th>COMPLETION EQUITY</th>
<th>BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee-Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee-Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION EQUITY</th>
<th>GENDER EQUITY</th>
<th>COMPLETION EQUITY</th>
<th>BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sul Ross State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University-Galveston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University-Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Shasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Virginia Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Virginia Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-BlackFaculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont State University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville State College</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Liberty University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utah Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Polytechnic College</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State College</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vermont Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington College</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Washington Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Universities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Universities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Universities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Equity Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Gender Equity</th>
<th>Completion Equity</th>
<th>Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Universities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

We do not believe Black students are largely responsible for their underrepresentation and lack of success at public colleges and universities. Factors such as low motivation, insufficient academic effort, fixed mindsets, low classroom and fixed
INCREASING BLACK UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

As many public institutions discover, a disproportionately high share of Black undergraduates come from only 4-5 cities and just a small number of private high schools within those cities. This signifies that recruitment efforts return to the same places year after year to find Black applicants. While strong partnerships between high schools and postsecondary institutions are praiseworthy, heavy or exclusive reliance on a small number of them is unlikely to produce different results from one year to the next. Admission officers must substantively engage a wider array of high schools to find talented prospective Black students.

State legislators and public postsecondary system executives must invest more resources into programs that specifically prepare Black students for college admissions and success. Prep programs for low-income, first generation, and underrepresented students are essential but not sufficient. Consequently, too few Black students directly benefit from them. Legislatures and public postsecondary system executives who wish to align Black student outcomes with Black representation in the state’s population should make money available to create new partnerships, to establish college access programs specifically for Black students, and to increase admission officer’s travel budgets to more high schools across the state with the explicit goal of recruiting more Black state residents. High-potential Black students cannot be identified without adequate travel budgets for admission officers.

Any college recruiter from any racial/ethnic group who wishes to enroll more Black residents could do so by employing the right strategies. However, it is worth noting that, nationally, 80% of college admission directors and 80% of admission officers are White. Undoubtedly, increasing the number of Black recruits a campus sends to high schools across the state (especially those enrolling high numbers of Black students), to places of religious worship that Black families attend, and to predominantly Black neighborhoods and community centers would help increase a public postsecondary institution’s chances of recruiting more Black undergraduates. Diversifying the college admission profession requires intentionality and casting a wider net. We write about a resource below in the Black faculty recruitment and retention section that would also help diversify admission officers.

Last spring, our center published a biannual report on Black male student-stress and racial inequities in NCAA Division I sports. Eighty-two percent of institutions in the report were public. In the study, Professor Shaun Harper suggested admission officers should look more like coaches who seek to enroll talented Black male high school students to play on revenue-generating sports teams. “A coach does not wait for high school students to express interest in playing for the university — he and his staff proactively, establish collaborative partnerships with high school coaches, spend time cultivating one-on-one relationships with recruits, visit homes to talk with parents and families, host special visit days for student-athletes whom they wish to recruit, and search far and wide for the most talented prospects,” Harper noted. Targeted activities such as these are necessary to recruit more Black students who are not athletes. We suggest the easest that affirmative Black undergraduates cannot be found, as public postsecondary institutions confirm year after year that they are able to miracles — usually behind Black men when millions of dollars are to be made from their labor on football fields and basketball courts.

RECOMMENDATIONS (CONTINUED)

ENSURING GENDER EQUITY IN AND BEYOND ENROLLMENT

For nearly two decades, higher education scholars and practitioners have lamented enormous effort into narrowing the gender gap in Black student enrollment. Women are now 52% and men are 48% of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates is evidence that these efforts have been successful at public institutions. It is noteworthy that Black women’s enrollments did not decline as Black men’s increased. What did happen, though, is that Black women’s gender-specific needs, expansions, and issues were largely ignored as institutions worked to address Black men’s challenges. This was wrong.

On campuses where Black undergraduate women considerably outnumber Black undergraduate men, or vice versa, we recommend creating gender-specific outreach and enrollment strategies. Together, specificity and strategy can help achieve gender balance. Systemwide Black male initiatives, recruitment plans aimed at enrolling more Black men who are not student-athletes, and campus resource centers and student organizations aimed at improving academic success for Black undergraduate men are all fine with us — as long as institutions also allocate energy and resources to understanding and meeting Black women’s gender-specific needs. Just because Black women perform better on equity indices such as the floor score in this study does not mean they are not other inequities that specifically disadvantage them. We suggest conducting qualitative studies on Black women’s and men’s uniquely gendered experiences, as well as disaggregating quantitative data by race and gender. Analyzing Black women’s educational outcomes in comparison to women from other racial/ethnic groups, as opposed to always using Black men as their comparison, would also reveal particular racial inequities.

GRADUATING BLACK STUDENTS AT HIGHER RATES

Decades of research make clear that high school preparation, affordability and financial aid, the treatment of academic effort, and high levels of engagement inside and outside of classrooms can influence persistence and college completion (Mayhew et al., 2018). Leaders at campus and system levels, as well as state and federal policymakers, need to take this research seriously and invest resources into initiatives that specifically prepare Black students for college and ensure they have the financial support necessary to persist once they enroll. Funding Pell Grants at levels that actually cover the cost of attendance for low-income Black students is a serious recommendation for federal policymakers. Giving institutions the resources they need to strategically address longstanding racial inequities must be among state and federal policymakers’ highest priorities.

In their 2018 study, UNC Rate and Equity Center researchers Shaun Harper and Charles Davis, along with their collaborator Edward Smith, discovered that college completion is not just about financial aid and the other aforementioned factors. Their research makes clear that Black students also drop out of college because of the racism they frequently encounter on campus. Educators and administrators must understand the relationship between environmental racism and Black student attrition. Data from our center’s National Assessment of College Campus Climate, an annual participation survey, would be helpful. Once institutions have data about how Black undergraduates differently and specifically experience the racial climate, various stakeholders across campus must begin to strategically address students’ experiences with racial microaggressions, racist stereotypes, erasure in the curriculum, and overt forms of racism. These experiences, not just academic readiness and financial aid, are necessary to ensure Black students also persist.
RECRUING AND RETAINING FULL-TIME BLACK FACULTY MEMBERS

Since its publication in the Journal of Higher Education in 2004, "Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Diversifying the Faculty" has become one of the most cited peer-reviewed articles on the topic of faculty diversity. It also has been used to guide practice on a countless number of campuses across the nation. We highly recommend that public institutions leads read it and employ strategies offered therein. Diversifying the Faculty: A Guideline for Search Committees is another incredibly useful publication for campus leaders, faculty members, and search committees.

Institutions must go beyond simply posting job announcements on their HR websites and in the Chronicle of Higher Education. Search committees have to be trained on bias, hold accountable for producing racially diverse finalist pools, and expected to write position descriptions that amplify the institution’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Aggressively disseminating ads through academic networks that include several Black academicians also is required for success.

The USC Race and Equity Center will soon launch PRISM, a professional networking and racial equity recruitment resource for colleges and universities. Eventually, PRISM will include thousands of employable people of color with standardized CV/resumes and work samples. Institutions will be able to search for and directly message professionals of color whom they deem qualified and potentially attractive for opportunities on their campuses. This will be one way to ensure that more current and prospective Black faculty members have access to positions at public institutions. In addition to faculty members across academic ranks and fields, PRISM will include administrators of color across sectors (administration, student affairs, academic affairs, and business services, to name a few).

Recruiting more black full-time faculty members without addressing racial climate and workload imbalance issues and assuring that White faculty colleagues respect their scholarship would be a waste of institutional resources. Turner, Gentilel, and Wood (2000) published a comprehensive synthesis of research about faculty of color. White professors and leaders should read this article, discuss it, and begin working in collaboration with Black colleagues and other faculty members of color on their campuses to strategically correct reservoirs of experiential realities. Anything short of this will guarantee perpetual imbalances in Black student-to-Black faculty ratios and high turnover rates among Black professors.
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ABOUT THE CENTER

The University of Southern California is home to a dynamic research and organizational improvement center that helps professionals in educational institutions, corporations, and other contexts strategically develop and achieve equity goals, better understand and correct climate problems, avoid and recover from racial crime, and engineer sustainable cultures of inclusion and respect. Evidence, as well as scalable and adaptable models of success, inform our rigorous approach.

The USC Race and Equity Center's strength largely resides in its interdisciplinary network of faculty affiliates. We unite more than 100 professors across academic schools at USC who are experts on race and racism, people of color, immigration, and other important dimensions of equity. These scholars work together on research, as well as on the development of useful tools and resources. When journalists, policymakers, and organizational leaders call us for expertise and assistance, we leverage our brilliant cast of faculty affiliates.

Rigorous, evidence-based work that educates our nation, transforms institutions and organizations, boldly confronts racism, and strategically achieves equity is what we do at the USC Race and Equity Center. The Center is home to the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates, the USC Equity Institutes, PRISM (a professional networking and racial equity recruiting resource), and the Alliance for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Business.

Website: race.usc.edu
Phone: (213) 740-0385
Twitter: @uscRaceEquity

USC Race and Equity Center
University of Southern California
635 Downey Way
Verna and Peter Dauterive Hall, Suite 214
Los Angeles, CA 90089-3331
WHEREAS, The consent agenda is a tool for increasing the efficiency of meetings; and

WHEREAS, The consent agenda is a procedure where a group of items are approved in a single motion without discussion; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown on the attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: August 21, 2018
ADDITION to Bylaws of the Academic Senate

Section V. MEETINGS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

Items appearing on the Consent Agenda are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. Common uses include, but are not limited to, modifications to departments, courses, programs, degrees; new courses; and editorial revisions to personnel policies. (New departments, programs and degrees must include a resolution and follow the regular approval path for resolutions.)

Any item on the Consent Agenda may be moved to the regular agenda at the request of a Senator within the allowed time. If an item is so moved, it shall be placed on the Business Items of the agenda as a First Reading item. Certain Consent Agenda Items, such as recommendations from the Curriculum Committee or Faculty Affairs Committee, may require special procedures.

Debate is not allowed on any item on the Consent Agenda, but questions for clarification are permitted.

Items not removed shall be approved by general consent without debate.
RESOLUTION TO MODIFY SECTION V. MEETINGS OF THE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Academic Senate indicate that attachments are not amendable; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown below:

SECTION V. MEETINGS
D. FIRST AND SECOND READINGS
Second reading: the motion to adopt a resolution must be moved and seconded before debate ensues. It then belongs to the body and may be amended. Documents attached to a resolution are not amendable, and cannot be removed or added to a resolution. Voting on substantive resolutions shall take place only after a second reading of the resolution at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate, by two-thirds vote of the senators present, may waive this requirement. After the motion has been moved and seconded, amendments may be presented for action by the Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 24, 2018

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.